



Massey University

Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa

Academic

audit report

Cycle 4 December 2008



New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit
Te Wāhanga Tātari

Massey University
Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa

Academic audit report

Cycle 4

December 2008

This audit report is the first report of Cycle 4 academic audits to be administered by the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit-Te Wāhanga Tātari during the period 2008-2012

Cycle 4 academic audits are whole-of-institution reports, and follow Cycle 1 audits on whole-of-institution during 1995-1998, Cycle 2 audits on research, research students, research-teaching nexus audits during 2000-2001, and Cycle 3 audits on teaching quality, programme delivery, the achievement of learning outcomes during 2003-2008.

The hardcopy printed version of this report is the version authorised by the Board. An electronic version of the report is posted on the Unit's website as a Portable Document Format [PDF] file.

© 2008 New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit-Te Wāhanga Tātari

Postal address:
P O Box 9747
Marion Square
Wellington 6141
New Zealand

Location:
Level 3
West Block
Education House
178 Willis Street
Wellington
New Zealand

Website:
<http://www.nzuaau.ac.nz>

ISBN 978 – 0 – 9582872 – 1 – 0

Preface

Background

The New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit was established in 1993 to consider and review New Zealand universities' mechanisms for monitoring and enhancing the academic quality and standards which are necessary for achieving their stated aims and objectives, and to comment on the extent to which procedures in place are applied effectively and reflect good practice in maintaining quality.¹ Since its establishment, the Unit has administered three complete cycles of academic audit.

- Cycle 1 academic audits were full institutional audits of the then seven universities; they were conducted during the period 1995-1998.
- Cycle 2 academic audits focussed on research policy and management, the research-teaching nexus and the support of postgraduate students, as well as a theme specific to each university; they were conducted during the period 2000-2001. In 2001, a full institutional academic audit was conducted at the eighth New Zealand university – the newly-created Auckland University of Technology.
- Cycle 3 academic audits focussed on teaching quality, programme delivery, and the achievement of learning outcomes, during the period 2003-2008.

The present cycle of academic audits – Cycle 4, of which this is the first – are full institutional audits, and are being administered over the period 2008-2012.²

The process of audit

The process of audit requires a self-assessment which informs an audit portfolio (structured with respect to the Cycle 4 framework) in which the university evaluates its progress towards achieving its goals and objectives related to the focus of the audit, identifies areas for improvement, and details intended plans, strategies and activities with respect to enhancement initiatives. After examining the portfolio, and seeking further information if necessary, the Audit Panel conducts interviews in an Audit Visit to the university to seek verification of materials read, and to inform an audit report which is structured in accordance with the framework for the conduct of Cycle 4 audits as set down in the Unit's 2007 *Academic audit manual*.³ The report commends good practice and makes recommendations intended to assist the university in its own programme of continuous improvement of quality and added value in the activities identified by the Unit as the focus of Cycle 4 audits.

Soon after the publication of the audit report, the Unit discusses with the university the preferred procedures to be used in the follow-up to audit and the monitoring of follow-up activities.

Massey University academic audit

Massey University agreed to an academic site visit in September 2008, requiring the submission of the self-review portfolio by the fourth week in July 2008. The panel appointed to carry out the academic audit of the University met in Wellington on 25 August 2008 for a Preliminary Meeting at which it evaluated the material it had received, and determined further materials required. The Chair of the panel and the Director of the Unit undertook a Planning Visit to the University on 19 September 2008 to discuss

¹ See *Appendix 3* for the Unit's complete terms of reference, its vision and its objective with respect to academic audit.

² See *Appendix 2* for the framework for Cycle 4 academic audits.

³ John M. Jennings (compiler), *Academic audit manual for use in Cycle 4 academic audits by the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit, Te Wāhanga Tātari, December 2007*, Wellington, the Unit, 2007.

the supply of the further materials requested as well as arrangements for the site visit. The four-day site visit by the whole panel to Massey University took place on Monday-Thursday 6-9 October 2008, hosted by the Vice-Chancellor, Hon Steve Maharey. This was preceded by a one-day site visit to Massey University Albany (Auckland) by some of the panel, on Friday 3 October 2008. The whole panel conducted interviews at Massey University Wellington on the afternoon of 6 October. During the site visits, the panel interviewed just over 150 members of staff, students and stakeholders.

The findings of the panel as expressed in this report are based on the written information supplied by the University and on the information gained through interviews conducted during the site visit.

John M. Jennings

Director

December 2008

Contents

Preface	iii
Summary	vii
Commendations, recommendations and affirmations	xiii
Preamble	xix
1 General	
1.1 Massey University	1
1.2 A vision for the future	2
1.3 One University	3
1.4 Goals, objectives and plans	6
1.5 Other factors	8
2 Teaching and learning	
2.1 Qualifications portfolio	9
2.2 Distance education and e-learning	10
2.3 Equivalence policy	12
2.4 Student support	13
2.5 International students	14
2.6 Library	14
2.7 Information technology	15
2.8 Assessment and plagiarism	15
2.9 Student achievement	16
2.10 Student evaluation of teaching and papers	16
3 Research environment	
3.1 Research capability, performance and reputation	18
3.2 Research students	19
4 Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Pasifika	
4.1 Māori and Pasifika education	21
4.2 Kia Maia	22
4.3 Pasifika@Massey	23
5 Academic and support staff	
5.1 Human resources	25
5.2 Workload	25
5.3 Professional support and development	25
5.4 Performance appraisal and promotion	27

6	Institutional quality assurance	
6.1	Quality assurance	28
6.2	Qualification reviews	28
6.3	Reviews and planning	29
7	Management and administrative support	
7.1	Management and communication	31
7.2	Organisational capability and capacity	32
8	Stakeholder engagement and external academic collaborations and partnerships	
8.1	Stakeholder engagement	34
8.2	Strategic collaboration	34
8.3	Commercialisation	36
9	Internationalisation	
9.1	Internationalisation strategies	37
	Acknowledgements	40
	Audit panel	40
Appendices		
1	Massey University key improvements	41
2	Cycle 4 indicative framework	45
3	New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit	47

Summary

General

Massey University	Massey University operates through a matrix of campuses and Colleges and there are three modes of delivery of academic papers – face-to-face, distance education, and block course teaching. The matrix creates a complexity of administration that is well recognised by the University. It is not easy for the University to develop an integrating culture bringing together the different campuses, their histories and their cultures, and to manage the resulting tensions.
A vision for the future	There is considerable excitement across the University over the appointment of the new Vice-Chancellor who had formally taken up his position only a few days before the site visit by the audit panel. The Vice-Chancellor is commended for articulating a far-reaching and ambitious vision for the University, but the panel recommends that the University reconsiders and prioritises its targets and strategies.
One University	The University is challenged by the task of finding ways to achieve the ‘one University’ culture and to manage the creative tensions that arise from the diversity resulting from expansion and mergers. The University has recognised that there are issues around communication, and the panel recommends that a University-wide information service co-ordination structure be established to enhance the capacity for distributing core information services. The panel commends the Vice-Chancellor’s decision to develop a national office. Attention must be paid to reconfiguring the Academic Board, involving strong leadership, so that it can provide a major forum for debate and resolution of academic items and provide a forum for driving the ‘one University’ policy.
Goals, objectives and plans	The three main high-level documents – the Massey Way, the Investment Plan, and the Road to 2020 – are all-embracing and ambitious. There is some work yet to be done to drive the alignment across planning and implementation documents. The panel affirms the University’s intention to revise the implementation documents with target key performance indicators, and notes that present performance indicators do not always include measures of progress directly related to the stated goals, objectives and strategic priorities.
Other factors	Reports indicate declining enrolments, and planning documents set high expectations for increased enrolments, but the panel was not aware of strategies to assist with this. Considerable focus on the Performance-Based Research Fund would appear to be placing pressures on academic staff workload management.

Teaching and learning

Qualifications portfolio	The University has a <i>strategic priority</i> to focus and differentiate its academic portfolio around the University’s academic strengths. Rationalisation should strengthen the quality of its academic offerings.
Distance education and e-learning	The University has a <i>strategic priority</i> to improve its university-level distance education provision, and another <i>strategic priority</i> to strengthen its e-learning capacity. The University recognises that teaching and learning generally requires underpinning by robust e-learning technologies and integrated e-learning. The University also recognises that the aspirations for the use of e-learning are not yet

matched with the appropriate support infrastructure, and has improvement initiatives in this area. The panel recommends that in confirming the strategic importance of distance education to the University's mission, the University needs to understand markets; recognise the pedagogical challenges for distance learners and implement supports and services as appropriate; embrace the changing face of distance education delivery; and invest in appropriate human and material resources. The University should also monitor the impact and effectiveness of investments in technical and pedagogical support to ensure improved educational success and learner outcomes.

Equivalence policy	The panel commends the University on the successful implementation and management of an equivalence policy that is aimed at ensuring the same learner outcomes regardless of delivery method or campus. There remains, however, an 'equivalence' challenge for the University with respect to offering papers offshore.
Student support	The panel heard that the agencies that provide support advice are effective in what they do, and that the Extramural Students' Society undertakes impressive work in supporting and advocating on behalf of distance education learners.
International students	The recent audit of the University's compliance against the <i>Code of practice for the pastoral care of international students</i> , administered by the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit, found that the University was fulfilling its responsibilities to international students more than adequately.
Library	The panel commends the Library for its excellent support for distance education learners. The Library provides excellent services to staff and students, and the University is attending to the uneven standard of library buildings across the three campuses.
Information technology	Information technology is campus-driven with overall management by the Information Technology Services. The panel is of the view that Information Technology Services should have input into new academic programmes and research proposals.
Assessment and plagiarism	The University is implementing a new assessment policy. The panel recommends that the University implements a stand-alone policy on plagiarism that treats plagiarism in the same way as other forms of academic misconduct.
Student achievement	The University has been improving its capability to monitor student achievement and success.
Student evaluation of teaching and papers	The chief survey instrument – Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching (SECAT) – underwent review and other survey instruments have been examined. The panel affirms the University's intention to participate in the Australasian Survey of Student engagement, improve the Graduate Destination Survey Questionnaire and the delivery of a teaching evaluation system; and recommends that the University gives priority to the implementation of an improved SECAT, makes the results more generally available, and makes known how the results are used.

Research environment

Research capability,	The University has a <i>strategic priority</i> to advance its research capability, performance and reputation, which is affirmed by the panel. Responsibility for
-----------------------------	---

performance and reputation research improvement lies within the Colleges. It was recognised that the Performance-Based Research Fund had guided departments in how to achieve their own strategic goals in research.

Research students The New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit’s recent monitoring exercise of the University’s admission standards and supervision of international PhD students found that the University had detailed processes in all aspects of admission and supervision which were applied to all students, domestic as well as international. The Graduate Research School administers doctoral programmes.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Pasifika

Māori and Pasifika education The University has a *strategic priority* to enhance academic outcomes for Māori and Pasifika learners.

Kia Maia The panel commends the Kia Maia strategy and the emphasis on capability building and embedding the implementation of initiatives. The panel recommends a stocktake of progress be undertaken in 2010.

Pasifika@Massey The panel commends the development of a comprehensive and coherent Pasifika strategy and the University’s commitment to its implementation. More specific targets across campuses and Colleges are required and the panel supports the University’s intention for more strategic collaboration within and outside of the University.

Academic and support staff

Workload The panel appreciates there are different workload requirements for different discipline areas, but was concerned that the University’s monitoring appears to amount to little more than ensuring each department has a policy, regardless of its nature. The panel recommends a more systematic form of on-going University-wide monitoring.

Professional support and development The purpose and functions of the Centre for Academic Development and e-Learning – which is the major professional development unit for academic and general staff – are to be reviewed. The work undertaken by the staff of the Centre is appreciated by academics, although access to the Centre’s courses across all campuses is a difficulty. The panel affirms the University’s intention that staff training and development work should be more strategic, and recommends that the staff responsible for training and development should hold academic appointments.

Performance appraisal and promotion There is general satisfaction with the Performance Review and Planning process and the implementation of the promotions policy, although in the latter, there were concerns expressed about the lack of feedback as to why applications do not succeed.

Institutional quality assurance

Quality assurance Pro Vice-Chancellors and Colleges are responsible for the monitoring of research, teaching, staffing issues and data related to student achievement. Data are collected, but little was reported by the University on mechanisms in plans for the

evaluation of data. The Portfolio for this academic audit was lacking an evidence base upon which the panel could assess its claims about quality and performance. Many of the University's policies and procedures allow for freedom of interpretation and application by Colleges.

Qualification reviews

The University places emphasis on the review of qualifications. Generally they appear to be effective instruments of change, but there needs to be a closer institutional monitoring of the follow-up to qualification reviews with a final sign-off by the College and the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic).⁴

Reviews and planning

The panel recommends that the University develops and implements an overarching quality assurance framework that includes systematic external reviews of key functional areas. The University should also develop strong and effective links at institutional level between quality assurance processes and strategic planning.

Management and administrative support

Management and communication

The University has a number of improvement initiatives related to communication, the optimisation of services delivery, the conduct of Council and its subcommittees, and academic and managerial decision-making processes. The panel affirms the University's intention to review progress of the leadership and management training package and recommends that professional development and training for all general staff be facilitated, particularly in the areas of leadership and management training.

Organisational capability and capacity

The University has a *strategic priority* to optimise the University's organisational capability and capacity, and has a number of improvement initiatives around facilities and capacity. The panel affirms the planned expansion of library facilities at the Albany and Wellington campuses.

Stakeholder engagement and external academic collaborations and partnerships

Stakeholder engagement

Stakeholders interviewed in Palmerston North affirmed the University as a great corporate citizen, and the University enjoys a high measure of support from local communities.

Strategic collaboration

The University has a *strategic priority* relating to strategic collaboration. The University prides itself on its connectedness with industry, communities and other providers. While recognising difficulties associated with financial and human resource costs and projected benefits remaining unrealised, the University has no improvement initiatives to address these issues.

Commercialisation

The University has a *strategic priority* to achieve a greater optimisation of commercial activities. The panel affirms the University's intention to develop a clear framework for commercialisation that includes an education programme for staff about commercial potential.

⁴ Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Research) at the time of the site visit.

Internationalisation

Internationalisation strategies The University has a *strategic priority* to implement its internationalisation strategies with respect to world ranking, attracting and retaining quality staff and high-achieving international students, and growing and diversifying international markets. The new administration wishes to achieve greater clarity around the area of internationalisation, and the panel recommends the University arrives at a clear understanding of internationalisation and internationalisation of the curriculum including a conceptual framework for the implementation of international initiatives. The University has improvement initiatives around international delivery of academic papers. The panel considers these will be necessary since the University's existing capability in distance education to New Zealanders will not necessarily position it to deliver academic programmes to international students in other contexts. The panel affirms the University's intention to develop support materials for staff who develop and deliver offshore programmes, and recommends that the University ensures that signed contracts are in place prior to commencing delivery of offshore programmes.

Commendations, recommendations and affirmations

Key: C = Commendations R = Recommendations A = Affirmations

NOTE: The words 'the University' in each recommendation are intended to refer to the agency within Massey University that the University itself deems to be the one most appropriate to address and progress the recommendation.

General

A vision for the future

- C 1 p.2 The panel commends the leadership of the Vice-Chancellor for articulating a far-reaching and ambitious vision for the University and the manner in which there has been extensive consultation and communication.
- R 1 p.3 **The panel recommends that, while continuing to develop its vision for 2020, the University reconsiders and prioritises its targets and strategies.**

One University

- R 2 p.5 **The panel recommends that the University establishes a University-wide information services co-ordination structure to enhance the capacity for distributing core information, to develop an overall information services plan and to be accountable for its implementation.**
- C 2 p.5 The panel commends the University for the decision by the Vice-Chancellor to develop a national office and home for the senior leadership team.
- R 3 p.5 **The panel recommends that the University reconfigures the Academic Board involving strong academic leadership and key academic personnel to provide a major forum for serious debate and resolution of substantial academic items, and to act as a major mechanism in driving the 'one University' policy; and that the University ensures sufficient resource is available to enable engagement of all its members.**

Goals, objectives and plans

- A 1 p.7 *The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 5) to have the revised Planning Framework [Implementation of the University's investment plan 2008-2010] with target key performance indicators implemented in 2008.*

Teaching and learning

Distance education and e-learning

- R 4 p.12 **The panel recommends that the University, in confirming the strategic importance of distance education to the University's mission:**
- **understands the markets and their needs through appropriate market research,**

- recognises the pedagogical challenges for distance learners and implements supports and services as appropriate,
- recognises and embraces the changing face of distance education delivery in view of changing technologies, and
- invests appropriate human and material resources to achieve international good practice.

R 5 p.12 **The panel recommends that, in support of all forms of academic programme delivery across all campuses, the University invests in:**

- **information technology support for e-learning,**
- **pedagogical support for the use of information technology in e-learning,**

and that the University monitors the impact and effectiveness of this investment to ensure improved educational success and outcomes for all learners.

Equivalence policy

C 3 p.12 **The panel commends the University on the successful implementation and management of the equivalence policy that also takes account of regional aspects.**

Library

C 4 p.14 **The panel commends the University for the excellent support provided for distance education students by Library staff on all campuses.**

Information technology

R 6 p.15 **The panel recommends that the University ensures Information Technology Services is formally consulted as part of procedures related to the approval of new academic programmes and research proposals.**

Assessment and plagiarism

R 7 p.16 **The panel recommends that the University implements a stand-alone policy on plagiarism that treats plagiarism in the same way as any other form of academic misconduct.**

Student evaluation of teaching and papers

A 2 p.17 ***The panel affirms the University's intentions (Improvements 7, 8 and 9) with respect to the participation in the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement, improvements to the Graduate Destination Survey Questionnaire, and the delivery of a teaching evaluation system.***

R 8 p.17 **The panel recommends that the University gives priority to:**

- **the implementation of an improved Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching survey instrument (SECAT),**
- **making the results of SECAT more generally available, and**
- **making known how the results of SECAT are used.**

Research environment

Research capability, performance and reputation

- A 3 p.19 *The panel affirms the University's intention (Strategic Priority 6) to enhance national research capability and economic growth arising from the advancement of Massey University's research capability, performance and reputation.*

Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Pasifika

Kia Maia

- C 5 p.23 The panel commends the University for the Kia Maia strategy and the leadership of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori and Pacific) with respect to capability building and embedding the implementation of Kia Maia throughout the University.
- R 9 p.23 **The panel recommends that, in 2010, the University undertakes a stocktake of progress made in the implementation of Kia Maia and the extent of uptake with the view to celebrate success and to inform the ongoing implementation of the strategy.**

Pasifika@Massey

- C 6 p.24 The panel commends the University for the development of the comprehensive and coherent Pasifika@Massey strategy and the University's commitment to its implementation.
- R 10 p.24 **The panel recommends that the University sets more specific targets across campuses and Colleges to drive the implementation of the Pasifika@Massey strategy.**
- A 4 p.24 *The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 15) to explore strategic collaboration internal and external to the University as a means to further develop and achieve the goals outlined in the Pasifika@Massey strategy.*

Academic support and staff

Workload

- R 11 p.25 **The panel recommends that the University implements some form of on-going University-wide monitoring of staff workload, with stronger University guidelines which facilitate equity of workload across cognate areas, and with approved mechanisms to allow divergences.**

Professional support and development

- A 5 p.26 *The panel affirms the University's intentions to align staff training and development to the strategic priorities of the University and the needs of the Colleges (Improvement 10) and to expand research on effective teaching and learning (Improvement 11).*
- R 12 p.27 **The panel recommends that the University strengthens the Centre for Academic Development and e-Learning by making strategic academic staff appointments with the appropriate research background, experience and expertise, and that consideration be given to appointing existing staff with appropriate qualifications and experience to academic positions.**

Institutional quality assurance

Reviews and planning

- R 13 p.30 The panel recommends that the University develops and implements an overarching quality assurance framework that not only includes qualification reviews but also the systematic external reviews of key functional areas such as Colleges, Schools, Departments and service and support departments.
- R 14 p.30 The panel recommends that the University ensures there are strong and effective links at institutional level between quality assurance processes (such as qualification reviews) and strategic planning.

Management and administrative support

Management and communication

- A 6 p.32 *The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 12) to review progress on the leadership and management training package provided through the Human Resources Section and develop and implement an action plan to deliver the management training required by new academic and general managers, and urges the University to give it a high priority.*
- R 15 p.32 The panel recommends that the University facilitates professional development and training for all general staff, particularly in the areas of leadership and management training.

Organisational capability and capacity

- A 7 p.33 *The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 29) to implement agreed capital development plans for expansion of the library facilities at the Albany and Wellington campuses.*

Stakeholder engagement and external academic collaborations and partnerships

Commercialisation

- A 8 p.36 *The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 26) to develop a clear framework for commercialisation that outlines the responsibilities of the Enterprise Team within Research Management Services and Massey Ventures, and includes an education programme for staff about commercial potential and the assistance available to identify and capitalise on commercial opportunities.*

Internationalisation

International strategies

- R 16 p.38 The panel recommends that the University arrives at a clear understanding of internationalisation and internationalisation of the curriculum after discussion with the University community, and develops a conceptual framework for the implementation of internationalisation strategies.

- A 9** p.39 *The panel affirms the University’s intention (Improvement 30) to develop support materials (including policy and procedures) for staff to develop and deliver offshore programmes in a manner that manages the risk and maximises the value to the University and its students, and urges the highest priority to the implementation of policy and procedures and to the training of academic staff.*
- R 17** p.39 **The panel recommends that the University ensures that signed contracts are in place prior to commencing delivery of offshore programmes and that each includes a definitive clause on teachout strategies.**

Preamble

▪ The self-assessment portfolio

In early discussions between Massey University and the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit [the Unit], the Unit agreed to the University's request for the self-assessment portfolio to be structured around the University's strategic priorities as detailed in *Investing in our future: investment plan (profile) 2008-2010 for Massey University* [the Investment Plan] which was signed off by the University in November 2007. This structuring was agreed to on the understanding that all of the topics and activities set down in the indicative framework for Cycle 4 audits⁵ would be included by the University and, as set out in the framework, associated processes would be included in the University's self-assessment of effectiveness, strengths and challenges. The Cycle 4 indicative framework asks questions about the output/outcome data and other evidence used to determine strengths and to judge progress, the mechanisms and processes used to monitor ongoing quality and provide input into continuous improvement, and an evaluation of the relevance and effectiveness of evidence, mechanisms and processes.

While the *Audit portfolio 2008* [Portfolio] as submitted by the University followed the agreed structure, it did not address the Cycle 4 questions and did not provide an evidence base upon which the panel could assess its claims about quality and performance. This was of concern to the panel. The Portfolio provided the panel with descriptions of processes and activities, supported the text with various strategic planning documents, reports and the latest annual report, and referred the panel to its website for policies and procedures.

The Portfolio included 32 key improvements in the areas of the University's qualifications portfolio, e-learning, student achievement, student evaluations, research environment, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, academic and support staff, management and administrative support, the impact of partnerships, commercialisation, and internationalisation. (The full list of improvements is listed as *Appendix 1* to this report.) Many of the key improvements referred to actions already underway.

The panel asked for a statement providing an update on all of the key improvements current at the time of the site visit. This was supplied. The panel also asked for the update statement to prioritise the key improvements and to identify those that are most significant to the future of the University. This was not supplied, and the University's rationale for not supplying this was that all improvements would be actioned within the three-year period of the Investment Plan. As a consequence, the panel paid most attention to those improvements which, in its view, are of significance to the future strategic direction of the University, as indicated in the strategic planning documents provided as part of the Portfolio.

Some of these key improvements appeared to the panel to address issues similar to those identified in some of the recommendations of the 2003 Cycle 3 academic audit report. The panel asked for a statement on those recommendations still outstanding at the time of the University's December 2004 Cycle 3 follow-up report to the Unit. In response, a spreadsheet was provided with an update on all Cycle 4 key improvements as at the time of the site visit, plus related recommendations in the 2003 Cycle 3 academic audit report, related University improvement initiatives in the Cycle 3 self-assessment portfolio, related recommendations in the 2001 Cycle 2 academic audit report, and related University improvement initiatives in the Cycle 2 self-assessment portfolio. However, no commentary was given on progress with the Cycle 3 recommendations from 2003.

⁵ See *Appendix 2* for the framework for Cycle 4 academic audits

▪ **A period of transition**

The panel was very aware that the academic audit was being conducted at a time of transition for the University with the arrival of a new Vice-Chancellor who brings his own vision of the future, and a desire to redefine the University's strategic direction. In preparation for the site visit, the panel had evaluated the Portfolio which reflected the strategic vision of the former administration. The panel had also viewed a video presentation to staff by the incoming Vice-Chancellor, and on arrival in Palmerston North, the draft *Massey University – defining New Zealand: the road to 2020* [the Road to 2020] was awaiting the panel. The Road to 2020 provides the new administration's vision for the future. The juxtaposition of the Portfolio and the Road to 2020 – which the panel could not ignore if it is to assist the University as it moves into the future – confirmed the transitional context in which the panel has had to carry out its site visit and prepare this audit report.

▪ **This academic audit report**

The design and content of the Portfolio, and the transitional nature of the University at the time of the site visit, presented the panel with considerable challenges. Instead of validating the University's own evaluation of its performance, the panel was required to seek the evidence to substantiate the University's own claims through four days of interviews – one day at Massey University Albany (Auckland), two-and-a-half days at Massey University Manawatu,⁶ and half a day at Massey University Wellington.

The structure of this report follows that of the indicative framework for Cycle 4 academic audits. The panel placed its primary focus on the strategic priorities presented in the University's Investment Plan. Although some areas in the indicative framework may lie outside the strategic priorities, topics around academic and support staff, and management and administrative support are essential to the achievement of those priorities, and were the subject of some of the University's improvement initiatives. The panel has also considered institutional quality assurance even though the University did not have any improvement initiatives in this area.

⁶ Since the site visit, the Vice-Chancellor has made changes to the nomenclature of one of the campuses – Palmerston North campus is now Manawatu campus

1

General

1.1 Massey University

Massey University operates through a matrix of campuses and Colleges. Research, teaching and learning take place on three physical campuses – the Manawatu campus at the Turitea site (the main site) and Hokowhitu site (College of Education) in Palmerston North and at the Ruawharo site in Napier (6,928⁷ internal students over the three sites); at Albany on the North Shore of Auckland (5,814 internal); and at Wellington (3,486 internal). A fourth campus – a ‘virtual’ campus – comprises distance education⁸ enrolments from throughout New Zealand and overseas, with 15,971 registered to the Manawatu campus. The three physical campuses are each administered by a Regional Chief Executive⁹ who is responsible for localised strategic planning, infrastructure and co-ordination of services in support of the delivery of academic programmes.

The development, design and delivery of academic programmes is the responsibility of five Colleges of varying sizes – the College of Business (12,961 students, internal and distance), the College of Creative Arts (1,981), the College of Education (2,887), the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (9,284), and the College of Sciences (6,657). Each College is headed by a Pro Vice-Chancellor who is responsible for the strategic direction of the College, budgetary management, and the quality of academic teaching, research and community service activities related to the academic programmes delivered across the University.

Responsibilities for University-wide policy development as well as the co-ordination, planning and monitoring of activities in specified areas are vested in Assistant Vice-Chancellors¹⁰ – one for Māori and Pacific, one for Research, and one for Academic (yet to be appointed).¹¹

There are three main modes of delivery – face-to-face instruction for internal students on campus (approximately 48% of enrolments); distance education (approximately 47% of enrolments) and block course teaching (approximately 5% of enrolments). Many papers are offered in all three modes, with some at more than one campus. During any year of study, students can enrol in papers in combinations of modes – for example, some courses as internal students and some as distance education students. This facilitates access by students to papers that might not be offered on the campus in the city in which they live, or papers that are offered at times that conflict with personal commitments.

The distribution of internal enrolments varies widely from College to College and between academic departments. For example, at College level, the College of Business, College of

⁷ Student headcount as at October 2008.

⁸ Massey University is a leader in New Zealand in distance education. Distance education is also described as extramural teaching, and students enrolled in distance learning as extramural enrolments.

⁹ Since the site visit, the Vice-Chancellor has restyled Deputy Vice-Chancellors responsible for campuses as Regional Chief Executives.

¹⁰ Deputy Vice-Chancellors at the time of the site visit.

¹¹ At the time of the site visit, the responsibility for ‘academic’ matters lay with the then Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Research).

Education and College of Humanities and Social Sciences have more distance education students than internal students (53%, 69%, 55% respectively), while the Colleges of Creative Arts and Sciences have more internal than distance education students (99% and 68% respectively). The range of College offerings varies from campus to campus, as does the number of enrolments on each campus.

Distance education is supported primarily from the Manawatu campus where about 70% of all academic staff are to be found. Manawatu is 'home' to the College of Education (92% of all College enrolments), College of Humanities and Social Sciences (73% of all College enrolments) and the College of Sciences (76% of all College enrolments). The Albany campus is the base for the Pro Vice-Chancellor of the College of Business and 'home' to 61% of this College's internal enrolments;¹² the Wellington campus is the base for the Pro Vice-Chancellor of the College of Creative Arts and 'home' to 88% of College internal enrolments.

This matrix creates a complexity of administration that is well recognised by the University. The University has in place systems and processes to manage this complexity and diversity, while permitting innovation, flexibility and regional difference. Nevertheless, the panel sensed from what it read and heard during interviews that this complexity makes it difficult to develop an integrating culture that brings together the different campuses, their histories and their cultures, and that harnesses the resulting creative tensions that should be directed towards stimulating innovation.

1.2 A vision for the future

A new Vice-Chancellor had formally taken up his position only a few days before the site visit by the panel and five months after the departure of the previous incumbent. It was evident to the panel from interviews that the University community on all campuses welcomed the interactions with the Vice-Chancellor that had taken place in the period leading up to his installation. There was evidence of considerable excitement across the University over the appointment of the new Vice-Chancellor, and the accompanying opportunities for new direction that his new leadership will provide.

Commendation

C 1 The panel commends the leadership of the Vice-Chancellor for articulating a far-reaching and ambitious vision for the University and the manner in which there has been extensive consultation and communication.

The Vice-Chancellor's vision is given detailed expression in *Massey University – defining New Zealand: the road to 2020* [the Road to 2020] in which it is stated that:

By 2020 Massey will be acknowledged as New Zealand's defining university and as a world centre of tertiary learning.

The Road to 2020 echoes the intention expressed in the Investment Plan (see section 1.4 below) for the University to be internationally regarded as one of the top 20 universities in the Asia-Pacific region and first in selected disciplines; it also expresses the intention of being in the top 50 world-wide, as well as a leader in distance education. In interview with the panel, Pro Vice-Chancellors (who are responsible for the teaching, research and service activities in the Colleges) appeared to be content with the vision. However, Heads of Department (who administer the day-

¹² In the College of Business, 52% of enrolments are in distance education and credited to the Manawatu campus.

to-day operations of academic units) appeared to the panel to take a more holistic view and were more circumspect and realistic in what can, in fact, be achieved. Incremental growth and development was seen as possible, and all agreed that continuous growth and continuous improvement were laudable and achievable goals.

The panel came to the view that to achieve either a top 20 Asia-Pacific rating as a research university, or be a world leader in distance education, requires considerable investment, and given present resources, it could prove too ambitious. The panel was concerned that the University will appear to be consistently falling short of its targets and that staff may become disillusioned if goals are not achieved. In addition, the investment necessary to support top quality research and research-informed teaching throughout the University may compromise other important aspects of the University's activities, in particular distance education.

A vision for the future is important, but it is the view of the panel that the University, with its three campuses with their distinctive histories, physical layouts, quality of facilities, and academic programmes, has to be more realistic about its goals. The University could do well to strengthen the multi-faceted nature of its operations and contributions, placing emphasis on existing research that is or can become world-class, and targeting its particular educational and delivery strengths. The panel is of the view that the University's vision should stem from its history and culture of undertaking a wide range of different things; applied research is defining of the University, as is distance education; and the University produces professional and practical graduates. This culture should be strengthened.

Recommendation

R 1 The panel recommends that, while continuing to develop its vision for 2020, the University reconsiders and prioritises its targets and strategies.

1.3 One University

At the time of this academic audit, the University was re-emphasising its 'one University' policy. Massey University emerged as a comprehensive university on the Manawatu campus during the 1960s following over three decades as an agricultural college. During site visit interviews, the panel saw a little of the three different campus environments and heard about different inherited histories of the present-day three campuses in terms of research and teaching focus. In 1993, the University developed a new satellite campus in Albany on the northern limits of greater Auckland, offering at first a limited range of Massey University papers. In 1996, the Palmerston North College of Education (established as the Palmerston North Teachers' College in 1956) merged with the University, leading to a reorganisation of teacher education and university education into a new College of Education and requiring the bringing together of two distinct academic traditions and cultures. In 1999, the Wellington Polytechnic merged with the University establishing a College of Design, Fine Arts and Music within the University (now College of Creative Arts), adding yet another cultural heritage to the University; and in 2006, the New Zealand of Music was formally established as a joint venture with the Victoria University of Wellington through the amalgamation of the University's Conservatorium of Music with the Victoria University of Wellington's School of Music.

Massey University continues to be challenged by the task of finding ways to achieve the 'one University' culture, and creative tensions arise from the diversity resulting from expansion and mergers. This requires creative solutions to capture the positive contributions to be made from three distinct regions and histories. Inevitably, tensions are present:

- between campuses and Colleges, where campuses seek to meet the needs of their regional communities, while Colleges seek to satisfy the strategic directions of their disciplines and the academic programmes they deliver on more than one campus,
- between the role of Regional Chief Executives who are responsible for providing the infrastructures to support academic programmes, and the role of Pro Vice-Chancellors who are responsible for both the academic profile of Colleges and for the delivery of academic programmes across campuses,
- between the resources required to support distance education and internal learning,
- between central services based on the Manawatu campus and the presence of those services on the Albany and Wellington campuses, and
- between the total educational experience of students on the Manawatu campus which is comprehensive in its academic offerings, and the total educational experience of students on the Albany and Wellington campuses with their more limited academic offerings.

The panel became aware of a perception of the University as comprising ‘Manawatu and two regional campuses’ with the Manawatu campus as Massey’s ‘centre’. Manifestations of this include:

- the access by academic staff to (for example) staff development programmes administered by a Manawatu-based agency and offered on other campuses whenever practicable to that agency, which can cause problems for staff unable to attend courses when offered and therefore are required to travel to Palmerston North;
- the operation of a department on more than one campus or programmes delivered by different departments across campuses, which has the potential to create difficulties of ensuring unity of operation.

Some people who spoke to the panel regarded some academic and administrative processes as cumbersome and slow, while the necessity to act regionally has the potential to put at risk the strategic approach to the University desired by the senior leadership.

The tensions associated with a multi-campus multi-College University are all keenly felt by the University and the senior leadership. There is a recognition that the matrix structure can make it more difficult to get the right people together to consider issues. It was acknowledged that negotiation can take time and can cause frustration, and that ways have to be found to share the synergies that can come from having three main regions to inform the ‘one University’. Strong advocacy and negotiation are required, which may result in compromises on the part of advocates when conflicting demands require resolution.

The Portfolio reported that self-assessment associated with this academic audit had indicated issues around communication. The University’s structure and the potential and existing tensions as discussed above create a complexity, and management of this degree of complexity requires the University to take steps to strengthen its communication infrastructure.

Recommendation

R 2 The panel recommends that the University establishes a University-wide information services co-ordination structure to enhance the capacity for distributing core information, to develop an overall information services plan and to be accountable for its implementation.

Nevertheless, it was apparent to the panel from interviews that people were going ahead and doing things, and that initiatives and new processes are often developed initially at the level of Colleges and departments. This leads to the general nature of many policies thus allowing for Colleges to place their own interpretation on them, which in itself creates the potential for variation in students' learning experiences.

The University is looking for ways to enhance the 'one University' policy, and the panel was interested in the symbolism and immediate impact of the establishment by the new Vice-Chancellor of a new physical location for a 'national office' for senior management with pan-University responsibilities. Such a separately-situated national office provides a clear indication that senior leadership is dedicated to the service of the whole University.

Commendation

C 2 The panel commends the University for the decision by the Vice-Chancellor to develop a national office and home for the senior leadership team.

A more tangible mechanism for the 'one University' is the Academic Board. The panel was interested to hear in interview, in particular from members of the Council and the Academic Board itself, that the Academic Board is not working well. The role, responsibilities and functions of the Board were not clearly understood, even by members of the Board, and there appeared to be no formal sharing of information among Colleges of the decisions made by the Academic Board and the Academic Committee (to which the Academic Board delegates much of the routine business). The Academic Board and its committees should, by virtue of their primary academic pan-University responsibilities, be the primary mechanisms to harness the positive consequences of, and to mitigate the negative aspects of, the multi-campus multi-College structure. The panel was also informed that members of the Academic Board not resident in Palmerston North were not supported to travel to meetings, and therefore attend only when the costs of travel could be covered by other forms of University business. The panel understands teleconferencing is not yet employed in these meetings.

The panel came to the view that the Academic Board must become an effective academic voice for the 'one University', and must be provided with the resources to facilitate adequate attendance at all meetings, either in person or by video/teleconferencing. Ways should also be found to assist the University understand the role of the Academic Board, and to communicate the relevant resolutions of the Board to the University community.

Recommendation

R 3 The panel recommends that the University reconfigures the Academic Board involving strong academic leadership and key academic personnel to provide a major forum for serious debate and resolution of substantial academic items, and to act as a major mechanism in driving the 'one University' policy; and that the University ensures sufficient resource is available to enable engagement of all its members.

Another cross-College mechanism that came to the attention of the panel was the forum of College Academic Directors through which information and effective practices can be shared. A similar initiative exists for the Regional Registrars to share information and good practices across campuses. In addition, the Federation of Massey University Students' Association Incorporated assists in this regard by bringing together representatives of the students' associations on each of the three campuses together with the Extramural Students' Society that represents distance education students.

1.4 Goals, objectives and plans

Prior to the site visit, the panel was provided with two primary strategic documents as part of the Portfolio submission, and with a draft of the Vice-Chancellors' vision to 2020.

- **Strategic positioning – the Massey way** [April 2007] [the Massey Way] was reportedly the result of more than two years of discussion throughout the University. The Massey Way defines the University as being a:

world-class university committed to excellence in teaching, research and research training; internationally recognised for its relevance, innovation, flexibility and accessibility; academically focused and strategically differentiated by campus.

There are five strategic priorities in this document.

- * *Advancing research excellence.*
 - * *Enhancing teaching quality and academic focus.*
 - * *Increasing the quality of staff and improving staff satisfaction.*
 - * *Effective engagement with community and industry.*
 - * *Addressing budget realities and achieving financial sustainability.*
- **Investing in our future: investment plan (profile) 2008-2010 for Massey University** [November 2007] [Investment Plan] builds on the Massey Way and develops a strategic planning document out of it, and introduces the idea of the University's intention to be:

internationally regarded as one of the top 20 universities in the Asia-Pacific Region and first in selected disciplines.

The Investment Plan declares:

Investing in our future will ensure Massey University continues to make the outstanding contribution to New Zealand's economic and social transformation through excellence and relevance in research-led education for which it is already known world-wide. We will deliver the key shifts and [Government] Statement of Tertiary Education Priorities now identified for the tertiary education sector by engaging closely with our stakeholders, being responsive to their needs, and making a dynamic contribution to the enhancement of national goals.

The national distinctiveness of the University is described as being based on three key factors:

- * *the unique contribution we make to New Zealand's land-based industries based on our strengths and leadership in agricultural, veterinary, food and life science disciplines,*
- * *being a national university with multi-campus character, and*
- * *our unique contribution to life-long learning in New Zealand through our comprehensive university-level distance education programmes.*

The Investment Plan identifies nine strategic priorities which:

reflect the positioning, distinctive character and operating environment of the University . . . [and] these priorities will enable the University to deliver the significant outcomes sought for New Zealand and the STEP¹³ priorities and key shifts for the Universities sub-sector.

The strategic priorities are worded as outcome statements. Each of the strategic priorities is supported by a description, outcomes and key initiatives. The Investment Plan also includes key performance indicators which include data reporting and statements on progress in achieving the feasibility, development and implementation of plans and strategic documents, but do not always include measures of progress directly related to the strategic priorities as stated.

- A draft copy of *Massey University – defining New Zealand: the road to 2020* [Road to 2020], which expresses the Vice-Chancellor's vision and contains six high-level goals for the University, was made available to the panel at the time of the site visit. The Road to 2020 was still in development at the time of the site visit, and known only to the Senior Leadership Team.

All three documents – the Massey Way, the Investment Plan, and the Road to 2020 – are high level, all-embracing and ambitious. There was also an acceptance by the University that some work is yet to be done to drive the alignment among planning and implementation documents down to departmental level and through performance agreements.

The panel agrees with comments from various members of the new administration and senior leadership team who accept that the plans need to be better aligned with the Road to 2020; that these documents need to be focused more clearly on the University's strengths in research and curriculum; that they need to be more definite in terms of strategies to implement change with some of the detail in the Investment Plan being removed and included in lower-level plans and planning strategies; and that planning documents require key performance indicators which provide much more meaningful measures of progress.

Affirmation

A 1 The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 5) to have the revised Planning Framework [Implementation of the University's investment plan 2008-2010] with target key performance indicators implemented in 2008.

The panel was unable to find much evidence in the materials supplied to it to substantiate the claims about University performance. Therefore the panel was interested in learning from staff of the Office of Strategy and Management (titled 'Strategic Finance and Planning' at the time of

¹³ Office of the Minister of Tertiary Education, *Tertiary education strategy 2007-2012 incorporating statement of tertiary education priorities 2008-10*, Wellington, Ministry of Education, [2006].

the site visit) that the University is implementing a more co-ordinated and formalised approach to institutional research into organisational capacity and institutional performance, with a new appointment having been made to undertake University data gathering and evaluation. The Office of Strategy and Management were of the view that it would be appropriate to undertake a stocktake of what the University does and to build a strong institutional framework for research into institutional performance, with better data to inform planning decisions. The panel is of the view that future planning and audit documents would benefit greatly from such developments.

1.5 Other factors

▪ Declining enrolments

Over recent years, the University's student enrolments have been declining significantly – a 15% drop in total headcount 2005-2008, from 39,645 to 33,770. There has been an overall 16% drop in distance education enrolments across the University. The panel was informed that some departments were being amalgamated on the Manawatu campus, especially in the case of small departments delivering papers over more than one campus and being unable to sustain themselves with falling enrolments.

The Road to 2020 exhorts the University to aim for a 30% increase in Equivalent Full-Time Students by 2016, but the panel was not aware of the strategies to be used to assist with this. The panel is of the view that the University needs to prepare and evaluate detailed demographic reports in order to determine why and where the downturn is happening and to inform strategies to address the medium- and long-term consequences of this downturn.

▪ The Performance-Based Research Fund

The panel was interested in the number of times the Performance-Based Research Fund [PBRF] was raised during interviews. The PBRF and the desirability of improving scores across the University were mentioned by staff at several levels who have knowledge of pressure on themselves and/or their colleagues. The panel was also made aware in a number of situations of funding being available for teaching buy-out to provide staff with time to progress their research, with the consequence that such buy-out resulted in the teaching being undertaken by teachers who may not be active in research. The PBRF has helped to make research explicit, but the reference to the pressure on staff arising from PBRF also highlighted the tension between research and teaching, and between fundamental research (easily accountable under the PBRF system) and applied research (not so easily accountable).

Just as interesting for the panel was the number of occasions the PBRF was raised during interviews with students who sensed that it was impacting on staff time, on the availability of staff to students, and on the time given to tasks associated with teaching. From comments made by both staff and students, the panel was concerned that in some instances, PBRF might be unduly overshadowing teaching.

2

Teaching and learning

2.1 Qualifications portfolio

The University Investment Plan has a strategic priority with respect to its portfolio of academic qualifications.

University strategic priority

SP4 The Academic portfolio of qualifications

Enhanced contribution to economic transformation and social development through a focussed and differentiated academic portfolio.

This strategic priority is described in the Investment Plan as providing an academic portfolio which is strategically positioned in line with the teaching and research strategies of each of its Colleges, delivering ‘nationally relevant and internationally regarded academic programmes’ through its three campuses and through distance education. ***Key initiatives*** include, on the one hand, rationalising academic programme offerings, building on recognised research strengths, and ensuring relevance of provision; and on the other hand, introducing a wider range of programmes in under-serviced regions, and innovative and practical postgraduate up-skilling programmes particularly in agri-foods and high-tech industries. Expanding liaison and mentoring programmes with schools is also on the agenda. ***Key performance indicators*** are around the key initiatives, but leave unstated how the University will measure its ‘enhanced contribution to economic transformation and social development’.

The Portfolio prepared for this academic audit supports the arguments made in the Investment Plan and includes University improvements around professional accreditation of professionally-oriented qualifications (Improvement 17); around processes to ensure the alignment of new papers and programmes with the University’s strategic goals (Improvement 18) and with local requirements and the overall academic portfolio of the University (Improvement 19); and around the need for better information about the relevance and position of the University’s programmes in relation to other providers and the needs of regional and international communities of interest (Improvement 20). The first of these is already part of the University’s practice, while the other three are to be expected of a University wishing to improve its strategic positioning.

During the site visit, the panel was reminded that the University recognises the need to rationalise its papers, and to build on its strengths. Some staff supported rationalisation because of their perception that the University was offering too many papers, in part to meet specific needs of students in order to attract enrolments in such areas. Rationalisation should strengthen the quality of academic offerings.

The panel also heard of the pressures placed on resources by the desire to improve Performance-Based Research Fund scores, which led the panel to the view that a review of the number of papers offered should be accompanied by a review of time and staff workloads to meet the strategic priority.

2.2 Distance education and e-learning

One of the historic defining features of the University has been distance education, and during the site visit, the panel was told repeatedly of the importance of distance learning to the University. The application of e-learning technologies has been a relatively recent development. The Portfolio and discussions at interviews pointed to the need to invest in distance education if the University is to maintain its standing. Not surprisingly, therefore, the University has two strategic priorities in its Investment Plan in this area – one on distance education, the other on e-learning; in the Portfolio discussion, the two priorities are brought together.

University strategic priority

SP2 Distance education

Improved educational success for learners from the continuous improvement of Massey's university-level distance education provision.

Distance education is described in the Investment Plan as a core and distinctive feature of the University, and that the strategy aims to enhance distance education 'through redevelopment goals with related initiatives' so that the University can 'cement' its position as the pre-eminent provider of university-level distance learning nationally and internationally. **Key initiatives** include building on the University's existing strengths, exploring opportunities to provide a wider range of programmes (including postgraduate study) through distance learning, expanding the level of learning support and building staff capacity for e-learning staff and effective pedagogy, looking to offshore distance delivery, and investing in infrastructure including information technology, library and learning resources in order to exploit the potential of e-learning to support learners. **Key performance indicators** are around completion and retention rates, student satisfaction, numbers of qualifications offered to international students overseas via distance learning, provision for under-serviced regions and populations, and infrastructure.

University strategic priority

SP3 e-Learning

Improved educational outcomes for learners from the strengthening of Massey University's e-learning capacity.

The Investment Plan reports that the University is finalising a strategy for e-learning that will integrate and strengthen e-learning within the wider learning and teaching environment. Two of the **key initiatives** reflect two of those for distance education – investment in infrastructure and staff capacity – while others require the redesign of papers based on effective pedagogies to support e-learning, development of a research programme to evaluate the impact of information and communication technologies on learners, and the integrated use of e-learning in academic programmes to enhance the development of on-line learning communities amongst all learners. **Key performance indicators** are around the proportion of papers that have an e-learning component, student satisfaction, infrastructure investment and the proposed research programme. However, there appear to be no indicators in the Investment Plan around improved education outcomes for learners.

The panel was pleased to see the coupling of distance education and e-learning in the Portfolio. In today's educational environment, distance education in particular, and all teaching and learning more generally, require underpinning by robust e-learning technologies and integrated use of e-learning in pedagogy. The panel noted that the Portfolio acknowledges this point and

indicates that one of the challenges is ensuring all academic staff are supported in their attempts to design and deliver distance learning materials based on effective pedagogies.

However, while extending the use of e-learning is widely accepted by staff – especially those in departments with a strong focus on distance education – the aspirations for the use of e-learning are not yet matched with the appropriate support infrastructure. The Portfolio reports findings from the University’s own self-assessment that there was a lack of technical and pedagogical assistance available to academic staff and departments for the development and implementation of e-learning in papers and programmes. Some staff interviewed were of the opinion that e-learning technology had missed out on major investment, and that staff required incentives to devote their time to taking advantage of the support available.

During the site visit, the findings and improvement initiatives reported in the Portfolio were echoed in interviews with members of Council and academic staff at all levels. There was a recognition that the University had lost momentum in distance education and e-learning; and that both distance education and e-learning require new investment in infrastructure and support for staff to retain quality delivery. The Director of Distance Education reported to the panel on the progress on programme redesign and in gaining staff co-operation to effect change through programme redesign, in order to bring distance education up-to-date.

In the opinion of some staff, distance education had lost ground because it has been so heavily paper-based; for other staff, there were concerns that broadband internet coverage was not accessible nationwide and, therefore, paper-based materials were still required. Staff interviewed recognised that the use of on-line for the presentation of materials only was not e-learning, and that e-learning well used is a vehicle to recreate and influence student learning patterns.

Given that one of the recognised distinctive features of the University is distance learning, the panel noted that the University improvement reported in the Portfolio in this area is very general and not yet well defined – namely, the implementation of agreed redevelopment goals for e-learning (Improvement 16). The Portfolio reports that ‘a set of redevelopment action points’ was under consideration at the time of the submission of the Portfolio, including the evaluation and selection of a learning management system. In interviews with staff, the panel was told about the proposed introduction of Moodle [Modular Object-Oriented Dynamic Learning Environment] as the platform to replace WebCT as the University’s learning management system. The business case for Moodle indicates that the strategic priority is ‘to transform Massey’s traditional correspondence model distance education to a more engaging and flexible form of learning which routinely enables students to engage with a new digital media’.

The panel was also told that the University needed to adapt to the changing nature of distance education, and the delivery of education more generally, leading to blended education that integrates the variety of modes of delivery. While the panel encourages this development, it is of the view that in assisting the University to retain its reputation for delivering quality student learning across a variety of delivery modes, the University must invest in human and technical resources. It must also increase teaching capabilities in e-learning by providing adequate support to assist academic staff apply e-learning technologies within pedagogical frameworks appropriate to their disciplines.

Recommendation

R 4 The panel recommends that the University, in confirming the strategic importance of distance education to the University's mission:

- understands the markets and their needs through appropriate market research,
- recognises the pedagogical challenges for distance learners and implements supports and services as appropriate,
- recognises and embraces the changing face of distance education delivery in view of changing technologies, and
- invests appropriate human and material resources to achieve international good practice.

Recommendation

R 5 The panel recommends that, in support of all forms of academic programme delivery across all campuses, the University invests in:

- information technology support for e-learning,
- pedagogical support for the use of information technology in e-learning,

and that the University monitors the impact and effectiveness of this investment to ensure improved educational success and outcomes for all learners.

2.3 Equivalence policy

The University is conscious of the distinctive characteristics and learning environment of each campus, and in the academic area it operates a policy of equivalence of academic programmes irrespective of campus or mode of delivery. The panel tested opinions on the effectiveness of the implementation of the policy and was told of ways departments ensure good communication. While delivery might differ, assessment is closely monitored and, in some disciplines, is the same on all campuses. Staff stressed that the equivalence policy requires a 'relationship of equals'. The panel was told that there can be tensions between the tradition of academics having freedom in teaching and assessment and the need for consistent standards across campuses, and therefore good communication and careful monitoring of learning outcomes become important to the implementation of the equivalence policy.

Overall, there is general satisfaction with the way the policy is working. The policy facilitates student transfer between campuses. Staff pointed out to the panel that having different lecturers on campuses was like having a change of lecturer from one year to the next on a one-campus university – the same learning objectives and learning outcomes are expected from year to year for the same paper. Innovation presents a challenge since it requires negotiation with colleagues on other campuses. The panel heard comments that with the intention to offer papers offshore, the application of the equivalence policy to papers offered in both New Zealand and offshore must be given careful consideration.

Commendation

C 3 The panel commends the University on the successful implementation and management of the equivalence policy that also takes account of regional aspects.

2.4 Student support

The panel heard that the agencies that provide student advice are effective in what they do. The University considers it necessary to provide good academic advice to students as quickly as possible. But not all students are required to receive academic advice at enrolment. Internal students – who realise they need advice – are possibly in a better position to seek advice than are distance education students.

This is a particular issue for Massey University with its large proportions of distance learners – 47% of all students, 63% of Māori students, 55% of Pasifika students – and the lack of advice for students can result in enrolments that are academically undesirable or unacceptable. The panel heard of a recent initiative involving telephone consultations with new distance learners within six weeks of their enrolment which provides a system for early intervention and referral for assistance if required.

Once in the University, Student Services attempts to consider student life holistically by providing services and support that cover all aspects – such as student learning centres (including support for students from targeted groups), student information centres, international student support, sport and recreation, health and counselling, childcare, disability services, accommodation and career advice. The delivery of student support services is devolved to campuses so that the distinctive nature and needs of each campus can be recognised and catered for. Regional Registrars co-ordinate and consult across the University. The University acknowledges the perception of unevenness in student support across campuses and the perception that Manawatu – which has the largest internal student enrolment and the most comprehensive offering of papers – has the best facilities. Resources have to be allocated in terms of priorities for each campus, recognising that budgets limit travel and exchange of personnel.

There is no systematic University mechanism for picking up low performing students, but there are initiatives around the University such as monitoring for non-submission of assignments.

In interviews, students reported general satisfaction with student support services. Student orientation, help lines, disabilities support and the student learning centre were given particular mention. The unevenness of support across campuses was raised, with an appreciation that the University recognised this and that signs of gradual improvement were evident.

There are several students' associations throughout the University – a general association on each campus, a Māori association on each campus, and one Extramural Students Society for distance education students. The panel was assured that communication among the associations is good, and all associations are brought together through representatives on the Federation of Massey University Students' Associations Incorporated. Association representatives reported to the panel that students' associations sometimes find themselves filling the gaps, particularly supplying information about the University and university study to students who call on their services, dealing with mental health issues and administering hardship grants.

Distance education students do not have the same opportunities as internal students to develop a sense of collegiality. They may be part of on-line study groups, and the panel was told that some papers may use videoconferencing. Therefore their students' association – the Extramural Students' Society – is an important source of student support. The panel was most impressed by the unqualified praise given the Society by all distance education students interviewed.

2.5 International students

The panel noted that in mid 2008, the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit conducted an audit of compliance against the *Code of practice for the pastoral care of international students* in the areas of student support, monitoring attendance to ensure student welfare, and accommodation provisions. That audit found that the University was fulfilling its responsibilities to international students more than adequately. The University provides high quality printed and website materials and an easily navigated website. The audit also noted the careful monitoring of student welfare by means of the student administration database, the Albany campus initiative of a Retention Co-ordinator who supports students at academic risk, and the implementation of a special checklist devised for use in times of critical incidents.

The University has an International Office based on the Manawatu campus, which is responsible for policy, recruitment, admission and compliance with the *Code of practice*. All three campuses have international student support centres, which provide the pastoral care to students in conjunction with the campus Student Services. The key aim is for staff on the three campuses to work as a cohesive unit in their services for international students. New ideas for pastoral support are often trialled on one campus and then used, with appropriate modifications, on the other two campuses.

Staff are in touch with students from the time that the offer of a place is made, with a significant number of contacts being made in relation to information, assistance and reminders by the time the students arrive in the country. The Manawatu campus scored highly in the 2007 International Student Barometer survey – an international system for surveying international students.

2.6 Library

The Portfolio reported that the Library continues to provide excellent services to staff and students. This was echoed to the panel in interviews during the site visit, with examples of supportive service by Library staff and special praise for service provided to distance education students. New academic programme developments require a Library report on resources, and this requirement assists the Library to anticipate resources required and have them available to the greatest extent possible before new programmes are delivered. The intra-library or inter-site service which provides a facility for overnight transfer between campuses was described as ‘brilliant’ and ‘wonderful’.

Commendation

C 4 The panel commends the University for the excellent support provided for distance education students by Library staff on all campuses.

The University is well aware of the uneven standard of Library buildings, and students interviewed commented on the uneven provision of the range of services at help desks – Manawatu campus, which has the largest Library on the largest campus, appears to be best provided – spaces for study, group work and discussion areas. Students reported that most students do not stay on campus, especially with the ability to work on-line. The Library was being expanded in Albany at the time of the site visit. There are plans to attend to the Library at the Wellington campus and a new information commons was opened there recently.

2.7 Information technology

Information Technology Services provides a range of information technology services to staff and students covering the areas of teaching, research and administration. Information Technology Services has regional teams on all campuses, and the national team at Manawatu has staff with special expertise travelling to other campuses as required. The panel was told that with separate budgets for campuses, information technology is campus-driven, which can cause tensions alongside the University information technology strategy. The aim is for all campuses of the University to be equipped with the same high-quality teaching facilities and information technology support.

The panel was concerned to learn that Information Technology Services does not need to be consulted as part of the process related to the development and approval of new academic programmes. It appears that Information Technology Services is not represented, nor in attendance, at the Academic Board, and therefore it is the intention of Information Technology Services to set up advisory boards so that it can become aware of projected needs to service planned academic developments. It was pointed out by the staff of the College of Creative Arts, for example, that the special information technology needs of creative areas appear not to be as well understood as they should be by the Information Technology Services, and that there needed to be more awareness of specialist needs generally.

The panel is of the view that Information Technology Services should have input into areas for new academic programmes and research proposals.

Recommendation

R 6 The panel recommends that the University ensures Information Technology Services is formally consulted as part of procedures related to the approval of new academic programmes and research proposals.

2.8 Assessment and plagiarism

The Portfolio reports on the development of the assessment policy and procedures approved by the Academic Board in mid-2008. At the time of the site visit it was too soon to test the implementation of the policy, although the panel noted that students interviewed reported that feedback on assessment was variable – from extensive commentaries, to nothing more than the grade or mark.

What was also of interest to the panel was the issue, raised by academic staff, of no increase in penalties for repeat plagiarism offences, unlike the situation in other universities known to panel members. Academic staff recognised that students have to be educated about referencing, plagiarism and the use of other people's ideas, and that a first offence can often arise through ignorance or lack of attention given in class to educating the student on good academic practice.

Many staff in the University use a worldwide on-line plagiarism detection programme, and means of identifying plagiarism are operated at departmental level. Assessments not administered centrally (such as in-term assessment and tests) are the responsibility of the appropriate Pro Vice-Chancellors. Centrally-administered papers and thesis examinations are the responsibility of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor. Academic staff found it frustrating that they were not able to escalate penalties with repeat offenders. The panel was of the view that not having a central register of repeat offenders or having increases in penalties for second and third offending does not conform to international good practice.

Recommendation

R 7 The panel recommends that the University implements a stand-alone policy on plagiarism that treats plagiarism in the same way as any other form of academic misconduct.

2.9 Student achievement

The Portfolio reports that a number of advances have been made to the University's capability to monitor student achievement and success, with the generation of reports on aspects such as retention, completion, pass rates and grade distributions. Such information is also used in qualification reviews. The panel was pleased to note that such data are being made available and noted the intention to review the definitions underpinning the generation of the University's retention, completion and progression reports and redevelop the reports so they can be used for accountability and improvement purposes (Improvement 6). The Portfolio also reports that a number of departments and Colleges have specific initiatives to examine and improve student achievement and retention.

2.10 Student evaluation of teaching and papers

The University regards the systematic use of student surveys as providing an opportunity for regular and structured feedback on University systems and processes. The panel is of the view that besides providing feedback on systems and processes, such surveys should be intended to gain feedback on the quality of academic programme delivery which provides information that is then used in enhancement initiatives. The Portfolio describes four chief surveys, and reports that the capacity to conduct, analyse and distribute the results of the surveys has been limited. There has been a drive to optimise their administration; the panel urges that the focus be on optimising the use of the information they reveal. The 'flagship' survey instrument – Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching (SECAT) – was reviewed in 2005, but the recommendations arising from the review have not yet been progressed.

Students reported that while the students' associations might be privy to the survey results, students at large do not receive feedback on the results nor on any changes that might have occurred as a result of the surveys. Student opinion on the surveys themselves was that the evaluation questions were too general and were not the questions that students believe should be asked. From interviews with staff and students, the panel understood that the approach to using SECAT surveys and the results they provide varied among Colleges and departments.

Generally, students were dismissive of whether the information gained from surveys was used to rectify deficiencies and enhance academic programmes, and the Extramural Students' Association was administering its own evaluation, *Rate it*. Information gathered was evaluated and reported back to students through the Association's publications and the students interviewed reported that they knew of academic staff who had referred to the *Rate it* results. Students' associations were also of the view that they had evidence that evaluations of the survey results had resulted in changes to the delivery of papers.

Besides the review of SECAT, the University is intent on working to improve student satisfaction and engagement surveys. The University intends to continue to participate in discussions regarding the Australian Council for Educational Research Australasian Survey of Student Engagement and to explore the continued use of the survey (Improvement 7), to implement agreed revisions to the Graduate Destination Survey Questionnaire and methodology

in 2009 to include the Graduate Surveys of Research and Course Experience (Improvement 8), and to review, update, and implement the recommendations of the Teaching Evaluation Working Party [2005] to deliver a teaching evaluation system based upon effective practices (Improvement 9). The panel urges the University to involve students and/or their representatives in these initiatives.

Affirmation

A 2 The panel affirms the University's intentions (Improvements 7, 8 and 9) with respect to the participation in the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement, improvements to the Graduate Destination Survey Questionnaire, and the delivery of a teaching evaluation system.

Recommendation

R 8 The panel recommends that the University gives priority to:

- the implementation of an improved Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching survey instrument (SECAT),
- making the results of SECAT more generally available, and
- making known how the results of SECAT are used.

3

Research environment

3.1 Research capability, performance and reputation

The University Investment Plan has a strategic priority with respect to research capability, performance and reputation.

University strategic priority

SP6 **Research capability, performance and reputation**
Enhanced national research capability and economic growth from the advancement of Massey University's research capability, performance and reputation.

The Investment Plan describes the University's research capability strategy as being underpinned by three work streams – human resources, College-based research management planning, and internal research funding support. The University is also committed to economic benefit realisation, innovation and knowledge transfer. **Key initiatives** include research and research training standards, recruitment and development of world-class academic staff, developing collaborative initiatives with national and international partners, updating and implementing College research plans, building Māori and Pasifika research capability and collaborations, commercialisation of intellectual property, expanding private sector research and development connections, providing specialist research equipment and infrastructural support and facilities, improving intellectual property capture, and establishing and monitoring key performance indicators for intellectual property development. **Key performance indicators** are around research income, research degree completions, research publications, and the implementation of key initiatives, but leave unstated how the University will measure its contribution to 'enhanced national research capability and economic growth'.

The Portfolio reports that the Office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Research)¹⁴ works closely with the Pro Vice-Chancellors and relevant personnel in other units to ensure policies and procedures are consistent and appropriate. Rewards for completed specified research outputs and a variety of other supports are devolved to Colleges, which suggests that the effective implementation of policies and procedures and the monitoring of research standards are delegated to the Colleges.

Staff interviewed by the panel recognised the support of the University for research and the development, by the former administration, of a culture of appreciation of achievements in research. There was a perception that there had been significant achievement in research in a number of areas and evidence included institutional, national and international research and creative awards and prizes, and the ability to obtain funding streams for research through external research grants. There was support for the University building on its areas of strength while supporting research and creative work across the Colleges. Some noted that the Performance-Based Research Fund had guided departments in how to achieve their own strategic

¹⁴ Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and Research) at the time of the site visit.

goals. Responsibility for research improvement lies within the Colleges, and while there was some scepticism about the vision to be in the top 20 research universities in the Asia-Pacific region, there was a belief that research output and quality will continue to improve over time across the University.

Affirmation

A 3 The panel affirms the University's intention (Strategic Priority 6) to enhance national research capability and economic growth arising from the advancement of Massey University's research capability, performance and reputation.

Besides funding resources, time available for research was seen as the critical element. While there was an appreciation of opportunities to buy out teaching time to divert to research, concern was also expressed that this may weaken the research-teaching link.

The Portfolio contained two improvements in the research area. The first is the development (already underway) of a research management strategy addressing the implementation of the Research Information Management System, the co-ordination and communication of services for research support, training of staff and managers in the use of the Research Information Management System and additional initiatives to support College research improvement plans (Improvement 24). The second is the planned use of the Research Information Management System in conjunction with information from Human Resources, and the Content Management System, to develop and publish an on-line expertise database (Improvement 25). The panel regards these as sensible developments in support of the strategic priority, and if research capability and performance are to be enhanced. However, these developments do not address the measures of the quality of performance (outside of numerical data related to publications and completions covered by the Performance-Based Research Fund exercise), nor the measure of the University's contribution to 'enhanced national research capability and economic growth'.

3.2 Research students

In June 2007, the New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit reported to the University on a monitoring exercise of University admission standards and supervision of international PhD students carried out by the Unit for the Ministry of Education. This exercise found that the University had detailed processes in all aspects of admission and supervision which were applied to all students, domestic as well as international. From an examination of written documentation, the conclusion was that the University had a robust admissions process requiring sign off that supervisors are of good national and international standard and have appropriate research records and experience and training in supervision. The assessment of the applicants' qualifications, literacy and ability to carry out the research projects is also required. From the examination of files and discussions with senior personnel with institutional responsibilities for the administration of admissions and for the oversight of supervision and support for PhD candidates, the conclusion was reached that the processes were being followed in practice, and that the policies and regulations were being kept under review to ensure that they reflect good practice. The University was also monitoring the quality of supervision through the central review of issues arising from progress reports.

During the site visit associated with this academic audit, the panel was able to confirm the generally strong support for research students, the training of supervisors, the provision of postgraduate handbooks, and the importance and effectiveness of progress reports for monitoring the quality of supervision.

The Graduate Research School administers doctoral programmes only, as other postgraduate research programmes are administered by the Colleges. The School was of the view that were it to be responsible for the administration of all research degrees, it could support all research students and play an enhanced co-ordinating role across all research academic programmes. Thought had been given to a University-wide supervisors' register; at present, one College had developed one, and the Graduate Research School was monitoring the initiative with interest.

A question exercising the Graduate Research School is how better to assist and support doctoral students who live and work off-campus. The possibility of negotiating with campuses or Colleges for on-campus spaces for such students was being considered. Students working off-campus have good on-line access to materials, but do not have access to a 'postgraduate culture' as do those on campus.

4

Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Pasifika

4.1 Māori and Pasifika education

The University Investment Plan has a strategic priority with respect to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Pasifika education.

University strategic priority

SP1 Māori and Pasifika

Enhanced academic outcomes for Māori and Pasifika from the implementation of Massey University's Māori and Pasifika strategies.

The Investment Plan claims that a strong focus on Māori and Pasifika development is one of the University's distinctive characteristics, and that the implementation of its strategies in these areas will make the University the 'pre-eminent contributor' to Māori and Pasifika professional development and economic growth. There are two primary documents associated with this.

- *Kia Maia: key initiatives for a Māori academic investment agenda at Massey University* (August 2007) [Kia Maia] is designed to align the University's capabilities with full Māori participation in Te Ao Māori (the Māori world) and in a global knowledge-based society and economy and to contribute to Māori capacity building.
- Implementation of the *Pasifika@Massey strategy: en route to cultural democracy* (July 2007) [Pasifika@Massey] will be focused on academic achievement, professional development, research opportunities, cultural diversity and collaborative partnerships.

Key initiatives associated with the strategic priority include the implementation of Kia Maia and Pasifika@Massey, and engaging with wānanga to develop effective arrangements to expand student opportunities through flexible and co-ordinated learning pathways. **Key performance indicators** are around completion rates for undergraduate, postgraduate and research students, and the successful implementation of, and extension to, Kia Maia and Pasifika@Massey respectively. There are no specific measures of 'academic outcomes' beyond completion rates, but if progress on the strategies is to be measured, data will be required on student enrolments, staff numbers, student retention, grade profiles, Māori and Pasifika content in papers, research projects completed, research degree completions and employment upon graduation.

The Portfolio recounts the history of the development of both strategies. It also signals that the Priorities for Focus Funding from the Tertiary Education Commission will be targeted toward more systematic course advice for first-year students, the development of learning communities and postgraduate forums, the establishment of a Centre for Māori Professional Advancement and the formation of research consortia around whanau and land and environmental management. Kaitautoko positions for Māori student learning support, and Māori and Pasifika liaison staff working from the National Student Relations Unit and within student services, are also noted.

The Portfolio has two improvements arising from the self-assessment, supporting the strategic priority with respect to Kia Maia (Improvement 14) and exploring strategic collaborations with respect to the further development of Pasifika@Massey (Improvement 15).

4.2 Kia Maia

The panel was of the view that Kia Maia provides a strong framework for progress, being informed by Government policy for Māori, the *Tertiary education strategy 2007-2012 and statement of tertiary education priorities 2008-2010*, University policies and priorities, Māori aspirations and various reports relating to Māori academic performance at the University and in tertiary education more generally. Māori internal student enrolments are around 250 in each of Albany and Wellington, 620 at Manawatu, and nearly 1,900 (63%) in distance education (total: around 3,020). The Kia Maia is an excellent model for implementing strategic priorities, with its unifying vision and its clear strategic framework, driven by excellent and influential leadership with support from the wider University through appropriate resourcing.

Kia Maia is being translated at the operational level in a range of different ways. Key appointments are being made in each campus consistent with regional needs, and in most Colleges to direct and drive the implementation of the strategy in the delivery of academic programmes, and thereby embed the strategy throughout the University. Champions in all Colleges are provided with resources, and staff at all levels interviewed were aware and supportive of the effort being put into the implementation of the strategy.

The panel was told of the aim to shift from improving access for Māori students to improving the outcomes for Māori students. Particular examples of initiatives being implemented included a Health programme for extramural Māori students which keeps in personal touch with students weekly, an effective engagement of Māori youth through scholarships, and the work being done with extramural doctoral students in Māori studies. Data were reported to the panel which indicated positive improvement in the quality of grades, in retention and in successful and timely completion.

In interviews with a range of groups during the site visit, the panel was told of the commitment by everyone to playing their roles in progressing this strategy. The approach to implementation varies according to the student populations in Colleges and departments, but is on the way towards becoming fully embedded.

Māori students interviewed were involved in mentoring fellow students and they considered this to be effective; they regretted that not many students were using the service. Māori are collective in the way they work and students were grateful for the availability of Māori work spaces, College-based Māori support personnel, Māori students' associations on all campuses, and other support networks. Māori students know where mainstream support services are, but tend to gravitate to Māori support groups.

For the panel, the design of the strategy, the clear leadership, and the investment of resource into its implementation indicate what *can* be done in this multi-campus multi-College University. This experience, if successful, could provide a good practice example for other University-wide developments. It was made clear to the panel that there is institutional buy-in, and this buy-in needs to be maintained. The panel hopes the University is actively considering a succession plan to ensure that strong and effective leadership is maintained when the present Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori and Pacific) seeks to vacate the position. The panel is of the view that strong leadership must be maintained if the successful implementation of the strategy is to continue.

Commendation

C 5 The panel commends the University for the Kia Maia strategy and the leadership of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori and Pacific) with respect to capability building and embedding the implementation of Kia Maia throughout the University.

Recommendation

R 9 The panel recommends that, in 2010, the University undertakes a stocktake of progress made in the implementation of Kia Maia and the extent of uptake with the view to celebrate success and to inform the ongoing implementation of the strategy.

4.3 Pasifika@Massey

Pasifika@Massey marks a beginning, and implementation has just begun. First developed in Albany, the strategy has been accepted on all campuses of the University. The panel was impressed with the vision and commitment of the Acting Director Pasifika (who reports to the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori and Pacific)) who confirmed the Portfolio's account that the initial focus is on the recruitment of Pasifika staff and students and on building research and academic capacity to support Pasifika endeavours within and across the campuses. There is a Pacific Island Advisor on each campus. Fale Pasifika have been established at each campus; the Albany campus has a Pacific Peoples' Consultancy Group and has been holding Pasifika graduation ceremonies since 2003; the Wellington campus has a Pasifika Learning Advisor. Reports on the academic achievement of Pasifika students are generated in the Office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori and Pacific) and examined annually.

Pasifika internal student enrolments are around 120 in Albany, 150 at Manawatu, 100 in Wellington, and nearly 450 (55%) in distance education (total: nearly 820). The panel was impressed by the positive attitude towards the University by the Pasifika students interviewed. The manageable size, and access to, the Albany campus was appreciated. The Pasifika initiatives in schools in Auckland were praised by mentors being involved in bringing students from school on to the campus. This scheme is successful in raising awareness of university education as a possibility for Pasifika students, and it deserves ongoing support.

Pasifika students told the panel that face-to-face support is important for them, and that such support is necessary for extramural students as well. The Fale Pasifika on the Manawatu campus provided a home away from home for students. Plans included the provision of at least one Pasifika support person in each College.

The students also reported that a mentoring programme has just been established, and for those who use the service, the mentors are perceived to be 'safe' people to approach for help. There is some training for mentors, but more mentors and leaders of study groups are required. It would appear that the availability of mentoring programmes varies from College to College. The panel understood that students would appreciate it being possible for the mentoring programme to be available in all Colleges.

The Portfolio acknowledged that one of the key challenges is recruiting and retaining qualified staff in the light of the demand for personnel from industry, Government and other providers in the tertiary education sector. In addition, there needs to be more engagement with Pasifika and other communities.

Commendation

- C 6** The panel commends the University for the development of the comprehensive and coherent Pasifika@Massey strategy and the University's commitment to its implementation.

Recommendation

- R 10** The panel recommends that the University sets more specific targets across campuses and Colleges to drive the implementation of the Pasifika@Massey strategy.

Affirmation

- A 4** The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 15) to explore strategic collaboration internal and external to the University as a means to further develop and achieve the goals outlined in the Pasifika@Massey strategy.

5

Academic and support staff

5.1 Human resources

The communication of University-wide human resources policy to departments and Colleges is through College Human Resource Advisors who assist in ensuring consistency in College-level policies and their alignment with University principles and policies. Advisors keep in regular contact with each other through teleconferencing. Staff concerns are considered by Heads of Department and unit managers, and may be referred to Pro Vice-Chancellors if necessary. The University has a trained mediation group comprising personnel outside Human Resources.

5.2 Workload

The University has a workload policy which provides principles for the development of workload templates at departmental level. The panel appreciates that there are different requirements for different discipline areas, but from interviews during the site visit, the panel became concerned that the policy is left up to departments to interpret. The University's monitoring appears to amount to little more than ensuring that each department has a policy, regardless of its nature.

Heads of Department interviewed were endeavouring to make the process transparent, and the panel supports a process of negotiating workloads during the annual Personal Review of Performance of staff. Staff appreciated the dilemma for Heads of Department, but it appeared to the panel that the manner in which allocation of workloads was made across departments was not always transparent to staff. Applied programmes can make demands that are not necessarily recognised, and supervision loads can be difficult to co-ordinate. Relatively larger numbers of papers with small enrolments can also impact on teaching workloads, and the panel is aware that rationalisation of paper offerings is sometimes undertaken to lessen this impact.

The panel came to the view that some form of ongoing University-wide monitoring would be useful.

Recommendation

R 11 The panel recommends that the University implements some form of on-going University-wide monitoring of staff workload, with stronger University guidelines which facilitate equity of workload across cognate areas, and with approved mechanisms to allow divergences.

5.3 Professional support and development

The Portfolio reports that the responsibility for the delivery of staff development initiatives is currently split between the Human Resources Section (leadership and management training) and the Centre for Academic Development and e-Learning (academic and general staff development). The self-assessment associated with this academic audit revealed that neither unit was delivering the programmes expected and required by staff.

The Centre for Academic Development and e-Learning is dedicated to the improvement of learning and teaching by conducting staff induction courses, undertaking needs analyses and training for staff, and advising on training and development policies and strategies to enable the University to meet its obligations and objectives. The Centre facilitates training and development in the areas of teaching and learning face-to-face, on-line or by distance delivery; it also undertakes research into teaching and learning, and is involved in enhancing the personal skills of staff in management and organisational development. One-to-one and group consultations are available in these areas in support of ongoing staff development, and the Centre would like to do more to work with groups (such as departmental groups and discipline-oriented groups) to supplement generic courses. The Centre also organises Vice-Chancellor's symposia, general staff training and general staff conferences, assists with teaching excellence awards and a fund to support innovative teaching, and co-ordinates teaching evaluations.

The panel was assured in interview that the Centre works closely with Information Technology Services as the provider of the information technology for the University, so that the Centre can adequately fulfil its activities to support staff in the effective pedagogical use of such technology.

The Centre admitted to difficulties in measuring how well it is fulfilling its roles apart from reports of satisfaction from those who use the Centre's services. Some academic staff interviewed by the panel considered the courses to be relevant and useful, but expressed concerns about access. Courses are easier to access by staff on the Manawatu campus than on other campuses where staff have to fit around Centre visits, or find ways of funding visits to Manawatu. The Centre is well aware of this, and it would like to provide equitable services across all campuses. Present resource levels do not make it possible to increase the presence of the Centre on the Albany and Wellington campuses at present. The contacts that are on those campuses are the front line of support, and to the extent possible, further staff are sent there from Manawatu if greater support is needed.

It is intended that staff training and development should be more strategic in the Centre's activities and the academic audit Portfolio indicated that there will be a review of the purpose and function of the Centre to ensure that training and development initiatives are strongly aligned with the strategic priorities of the University and the needs of the Colleges (Improvement 10). It is also intended to ensure that opportunities for expanding research on effective teaching and learning are explored fully and within the context of external funds that may be available, internal research clusters within the Colleges, and the work of the Centre (Improvement 11). These are important developments, and the panel is of the view that the experience and expertise that these developments require of staff in the Centre should be given enhanced credibility. The panel was surprised to learn that none of the Centre staff have academic appointments. This was independently raised by academic staff who considered a Centre such as this one can best fulfil its commitments to research and research-informed teaching by employing staff who are part of the academic community.

Affirmation

A 5 The panel affirms the University's intentions to align staff training and development to the strategic priorities of the University and the needs of the Colleges (Improvement 10) and to expand research on effective teaching and learning (Improvement 11).

Recommendation

- R 12** The panel recommends that the University strengthens the Centre for Academic Development and e-Learning by making strategic academic staff appointments with the appropriate research background, experience and expertise, and that consideration be given to appointing existing staff with appropriate qualifications and experience to academic positions.

5.4 Performance appraisal and promotion

The panel discussed with staff the annual Performance Review and Planning process and the promotions process. Normally the annual performance review for academic staff includes discussions on the results of the Student Evaluation of Content, Administration and Teaching (SECAT), and contains a forward-looking planning component including discussions on workload, professional development intentions, preparation for promotion, and feedback for staff who were unsuccessful with promotion. Staff reported general satisfaction with this process and regarded it as valuable and positive. Appreciation was expressed for the support shown by Heads of Department through this process.

There was general satisfaction, too, with the implementation of the promotions policy, although some concerns were expressed about the lack of feedback as to why applications do not succeed, and calls for better and more systematic feedback to unsuccessful applicants. There was also a perception that the impact of the Performance-Based Research Fund resulted in a tendency for research to count for more in promotions than teaching, particularly at higher levels of promotion.

6

Institutional quality assurance

6.1 Quality assurance

The Portfolio states that the responsibility for continuous quality improvement lies with every member of staff, and that senior managers (such as Assistant Vice-Chancellors, Pro Vice-Chancellors) are responsible for quality assurance in their areas. Interviews during the site visit backed this statement, especially with constant reference to the responsibilities of Pro Vice-Chancellors and Colleges for the implementation of policies and procedures related to academic matters, and for the monitoring of research, teaching, staffing issues and data related to student achievement.

The Portfolio states that an emphasis is placed on gathering accurate information that is valid with an equal focus on quantitative and qualitative data. Little is reported, however, about the mechanisms for the evaluation of data. As already noted in the Preamble, the Portfolio itself was lacking an evidence base upon which the panel could assess its claims about quality and performance; and section 1.4 of this report notes that the panel was informed that the University is implementing a more co-ordinated and formal approach to institutional research into organisational capacity and institutional performance, with a new appointment to undertake University data gathering and evaluation. The panel was also interested to hear from members of Council that, while they receive statistics and other data, they do not always receive commentaries that explain the impact of that data or what is behind the statistics.

From what it read and heard, the panel came to the view that the institutional quality assurance framework was built around University policies and procedures – many of which allowed for freedom of interpretation and application by Colleges – the administration of surveys, and the gathering and reporting of activities, output data and survey results. Symptomatic of this approach was the observation in the Portfolio that reporting against targets and indicators within the *Annual report* is undertaken to meet the requirements of the Education Act 1989. There was no suggestion in the Portfolio that the *Annual report* has the potential to be used as an important management instrument for the University, nor how the information it reports is evaluated and fed into the planning cycle.

6.2 Qualification reviews

The University places emphasis on the review of qualifications to evaluate systematically the quality and relevance of the University's academic awards. During site visit discussions on the maintenance and enhancement of academic standards and quality, the panel was often referred to qualification reviews, strengthening the perception that qualification reviews are used as a primary quality assurance and quality enhancement instrument.

A qualification review is a review of an entire academic programme and composite majors through peer evaluation of the programme's objectives, structure and management, teaching, learning and assessment processes. Colleges have the responsibility to implement the procedures, prepare the schedule of reviews to be conducted each year, and to oversee the

follow-up on recommendations. An implementation group is set up after each review to oversee the implementation of the recommendations, and the group reports to the University six months after the review on actions to be taken arising from the report. The University does not require anything further, but the group reports to the College until every aspect is addressed. There is no central follow-up unless the office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic) wishes to do so.

The panel was provided with the schedule for qualification reviews, and noted that some of the reviews had not provided follow up reports within the expected timeframe. An examination of the documentation of a sample of qualification reviews indicated that the six-month follow-up reports tended to be summaries of implementation plans, and that further follow-up and monitoring of change arising from qualification reviews was then the responsibility of Colleges, with no further accountability to the University.

Interviews with staff involved in the review progress provided examples of substantial change to academic programmes arising from qualification reviews with the key indicators of change being academic proposals progressing through the Academic Committee and Academic Board. It was admitted to the panel that it was sometimes difficult to get closure, and that it was the responsibility of the Pro Vice-Chancellor of the College to ensure that this occurs. The panel understands that the Academic Committee has responsibility to ensure the Pro Vice-Chancellors and Colleges complete the process.

The panel was told that meetings of the Academic Directors forum, chaired by the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic), have provided effective fora for the sharing of good academic practice arising from qualification reviews.

The panel came to the view that, while the qualification reviews are generally effective instruments of change, the University should be assured that the implementation of plans arising from the reviews has been effective and in line with the expectations of the aims and purpose of the qualifications review policy. In the view of the panel, there needs to be a closer institutional monitoring of the follow-up to qualification reviews, with a final sign-off by Colleges and the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic), after all recommendations have been satisfactorily addressed.

6.3 Reviews and planning

Qualification reviews have to a great extent replaced the former departmental reviews, and there are now no systematic reviews of Colleges, schools and academic units, although special reviews of departments and Colleges can occur as part of the College planning and resourcing process. Colleges have not been reviewed since their establishment, and the Portfolio reports that restructuring has occurred in four of the five Colleges. In interview, the Pro Vice-Chancellors suggested that it has not been restructuring so much as ongoing refining of structures within the Colleges, reconfiguring departments into schools and institutes, and realigning administrative support services in order to reposition the Colleges to be more effective in the delivery of their academic programmes. Much of this refining and reconfiguring arises out of College planning activities.

Reviews of the key academic units that have responsibilities for the conduct of research and delivery of academic programmes should be required to cover aspects of the research environment, facilities and resource implications facing academic units contributing to the delivery of academic programmes, which are not necessarily dealt with directly in qualification

reviews. The information obtained from these reviews should then be fed into the planning process; at present, it is not clear how this might happen.

Recommendation

R 13 The panel recommends that the University develops and implements an overarching quality assurance framework that not only includes qualification reviews but also the systematic external reviews of key functional areas such as Colleges, Schools, Departments and service and support departments.

Recommendation

R 14 The panel recommends that the University ensures there are strong and effective links at institutional level between quality assurance processes (such as qualification reviews) and strategic planning.

7

Management and administrative support

7.1 Management and communication

The Portfolio reported that the self-assessment associated with this academic audit indicated that there were ‘opportunities’ for better cohesion between the Colleges and central services, and that there was a perception of a divide between central services and the Colleges such that needed services were not available or provided, and communication channels were not effective. From interviews during the site visit, the panel was made aware of communication issues arising from the complex matrix of three physical campuses and one ‘virtual’ campus (distance education), and the delivery of academic programmes by five Colleges across the four campuses to varying degrees (see section 1.1 of this report). The panel also heard of the desire to develop a better understanding of the relationship between Council and management.

The University is attempting to address this with an initiative relating to communication and other initiatives relating to specific aspects of management and governance. In summary, they are:

- an evaluation of existing methods of communication and ways of informing staff about initiatives and services (Improvement 1),
- the completion and implementation of an Optimisation of Services Delivery Project (Improvement 2),
- the completion and implementation of the *Guidelines for the conduct of Council and Council subcommittees* to enhance governance capability (Improvement 3),
- the examination of academic and managerial decision-making processes (Improvement 4),

Another area that was raised during site visit interviews was the lack of leadership and management training which, in the view of the panel, is an urgent matter given the complexity of the structure of the University and the reported findings of the self-assessment. The panel noted the initiative to address leadership and management training (Improvement 12). The panel was made aware during interviews with staff and Human Resources management that there was no formal induction for new managers, very little management training and a lack of leadership training. This was of concern among sectors of managerial and administrative staff. The panel understands that there used to be in-house management training, and Human Resources is working on a process to define management leadership with a view to developing a new programme.

Affirmation

- A 6** The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 12) to review progress on the leadership and management training package provided through the Human Resources Section and develop and implement an action plan to deliver the management training required by new academic and general managers, and urges the University to give it a high priority.

Interviews also suggested that more should be made available in the area of general staff training.

Recommendation

- R 15** The panel recommends that the University facilitates professional development and training for all general staff, particularly in the areas of leadership and management training.

7.2 Organisational capability and capacity

The University Investment Plan has a strategic priority with respect to its organisational capability and capacity.

University strategic priority

- SP8** **Organisational capability and capacity**
Enhanced international reputation and competitiveness of New Zealand's university sector through the optimisation of Massey University's organisational capability and capacity.

The Investment Plan states that, consistent with being a world-class university (which is not defined but appears to refer to the intention to be internationally regarded as one of the top 20 universities in the Asia-Pacific region and first in selected disciplines), the University needs supporting management practices of the highest international standard. The University needs to ensure a sustainable resource base sufficient to pursue its primary aims, have competent, effective and accountable staff and management at all levels, and support teaching, learning and research activities through the provision of quality infrastructure, national shared services and regional support activities. *Key initiatives* include the development of the Strategic Asset Management Plan to support investment decisions, completion of the Information System Strategic Plan to assess investment decisions against strategic objectives, the completion of the services optimisation project to optimise performance, continued investment in the library infrastructure, relocation of the College of Education from the Hokowhitu site to the Turitea site, development and implementation of Strategic Capability Plans across the University, exploration of opportunities for international accreditation at provider and service levels to become a recognised provider in other countries, and investment in continuous improvement strategies. *Key performance indicators* are around first-year attrition rates, qualification completion rates, standard financial indicators, and the development and implementation of plans and projects as set out in the key initiatives. The way these initiatives and indicators relate to the measurement of an enhanced international reputation and competitiveness of the University is not made clear.

The Portfolio summarises the initiatives as relating to improving the 'corporate' capability of the University, and notes that the opportunities for international accreditation and the recognition of the University as a quality provider offshore will be strongly aligned to the University's

academic specialisations and rationalisation of the academic portfolio (see section 2.1 above). Improvement initiatives centre on the development and implementation of management and capability plans (Improvements 27 and 28) and capital development plans for library facilities (Improvement 29). Of these, the last has the most immediate impact on research, teaching and learning. During site visits, the panel was told at the Albany campus of the commencement of the extension of the library there, and heard at the Wellington campus that staff and students were resigned to ongoing delays to the expansion of the library and provision of adequate library facilities there.

Affirmation

A 7 The panel affirms the University’s intention (Improvement 29) to implement agreed capital development plans for expansion of the library facilities at the Albany and Wellington campuses.

8

Stakeholder engagement and external academic collaborations and partnerships

8.1 Stakeholder engagement

The primary stakeholders of the University are, of course, the students who must enjoy a distinctive relationship with the University. They are very much part of the University community and are key partners with academic staff in the educational endeavour. Of particular interest to the panel, therefore, was the somewhat surprising improvement initiative, to be found in this section of the Portfolio dealing with strategic collaboration with providers, that related to the mechanisms used for student engagement in all aspects of the University's operations (Improvement 23). Clearly the panel is supportive of any activity that improves student engagement in University operations. However, the panel is of the view that while students may be stakeholders, they are not providers.

During the site visit, the panel interviewed external stakeholders from the City of Palmerston North including community agencies, employers and professional associations, all of whom found the University easy to work with and possessing an easy culture for interaction. The stakeholders stated that the University is a great corporate citizen, and has been responsive to meeting needs in the Māori communities. While there were concerns expressed about specific aspects of the attributes of graduates in specific discipline areas, and the apparent reduction in fundamental research in favour of applied research, there was, overall, an acceptance of the standard of University graduates. It was clear from the discussion that the University enjoys a high measure of support from outside communities and stakeholders, evidenced by the accounts of the high level of engagement.

8.2 Strategic collaboration

The University Investment Plan has a strategic priority with respect to strategic collaboration.

University strategic priority

SP5 Strategic collaboration

Enhanced contribution to economic transformation and social development through strategic collaboration with industry, communities and other providers.

The Investment Plan gives notice that the University will continue to enhance its contribution to the national network of education and research provision through collaborative relationships with industries, communities and other providers within and beyond New Zealand. ***Key initiatives*** include further enhancement and development of partnerships with industry and communities of interest, further development and leverage of the University's alumni network, extending the University's research in the business and land-based disciplines, offering specialist services to other educational providers, the establishment and/or further development of centres for research excellence, exploring the establishment of a national College of Agriculture, Food and Life

Sciences by working with Lincoln University, industry and the Tertiary Education Commission, and the establishment of a Māori and Indigenous Business and Governance Consortium. **Key performance indicators** centre on qualification reviews that include engagement with stakeholders, qualifications offered in partnership with other providers, and the implementation of the initiatives. The way the University will measure its ‘enhanced contribution to economic transformation and social development’ arising from the implementation of the initiatives is not made clear.

The Portfolio reported that the University prides itself on its connectedness with industry, communities and other providers, but noted that the self-assessment process indicated difficulties associated with the financial and human resource costs required to make collaborations work, and acknowledged that projected benefits often remain unrealised. The panel would have been interested to know of strategies to address these difficulties, but the University improvements in this area do not appear to address these important issues of costs and projected benefits. Instead, the University improvements in this area refer to two examples identified by the University as strengths – exploring systems and processes to enhance research and knowledge transfer between the University and centres of research excellence (Improvement 22) and working with Victoria University of Wellington to streamline existing arrangements for programme development and approval in the New Zealand School of Music (Improvement 21).

The panel was interested in learning more about the New Zealand School of Music on account of its prominence in the Investment Plan (the School’s investment plan is included as an annex to the Plan) and the statement that the School ‘will be New Zealand’s pre-eminent provider of university-level music education, research, composition and performance’, with programmes that ‘are to be of world class’. The academic audit Portfolio claims that the School ‘continues to go from strength to strength based on student demand’.

The School’s investment plan indicates that the academic programmes are delivered from each university; that staff who contribute to the delivery of academic programmes in the School are employed by the universities in which they teach; and that students are enrolled by Victoria University of Wellington who have a Service Level Agreement which makes it possible for Massey University to teach students at Massey University’s Conservatorium of Music. At present, only the Director of the School and administrative staff are employed by the School. It is proposed to build a separate purpose-built facility in central Wellington to house the School, and to bring staff and students from both institutions into one teaching, learning and performance space.

The panel was asked by the University and by the Victoria University of Wellington senior management not to investigate the School of Music as part of an academic audit of Massey University alone. This raises the question whether the New Zealand School of Music should be the subject of a special academic audit at some later stage. The panel was disappointed not to be able to investigate further given the emphasis placed on the School as a working collaboration and the reported success of the School, albeit with respect to student demand only, and the panel is unable to comment on the success or otherwise of this collaborative venture. There is interest in this kind of inter-university collaboration, and in the details of processes and quality assurance surrounding the development of the academic community and the development and delivery of academic programmes in such a venture. An evaluation of the nature and effectiveness of such processes will have to await later investigation.

8.3 Commercialisation

The University Investment Plan has a strategic priority with respect to strategic collaboration.

University strategic priority

SP7 Commercialisation

Enhanced economic growth for New Zealand and Massey University through the optimisation of commercial activities.

The Investment Plan reports that the University is involved in a number of commercial activities ranging from commercialisation of intellectual property to other commercial business activities, which assist the University generate income. **Key initiatives** include the implementation of a University commercialisation framework and strengthening of connections between the University's portfolio of intellectual property and economic growth, further development of the role of Massey Ventures Limited, the development of more extensive relationships between the University and private sector agencies, and opportunities for enhancing the performance of the University's other commercial activities. Initiatives also include the development and implementation of a university-wide strategy for short courses and professional development programmes, and the establishment of a national commercial centre to support innovation and economic transformation in agri-foods. **Key performance indicators** are around licensing revenue, research and consulting income, number of licences and the implementation of the initiatives. It appears that while these indicators measure the University's economic growth in this area, ways of measuring 'enhanced economic growth for New Zealand' are yet to be determined, although in interview with members of Research Management Services, it was evident that measures might include turnover signifying growth in the economy, and spin-off companies from the commercialisation of the research.

In interview, the main benefits identified from commercialisation and the work by agencies such as Massey Ventures Limited stem from the reputation of the University for research that can be applied, which, in turn, will lead to further work and further funding for research. The University's self-assessment suggested that an understanding of commercialisation was in the early stages of development, with an uncertainty about requirements, or whether the University was positioned to achieve the outcomes stated in the investment plan (which are described as 'economic growth for the university and the nation'). This was confirmed from the experience of Research Management Services in interview, who also acknowledged that commercial ventures do not fit within the Performance-Based Research Fund and may also not feed into academic promotions. Nevertheless, as indicated in the Portfolio, there is a need to develop a clear framework for commercialisation.

Affirmation

A 8 The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 26) to develop a clear framework for commercialisation that outlines the responsibilities of the Enterprise Team within Research Management Services and Massey Ventures, and includes an education programme for staff about commercial potential and the assistance available to identify and capitalise on commercial opportunities.

Internationalisation

9.1 Internationalisation strategies

The University Investment Plan has a strategic priority with respect to internationalisation.

University strategic priority

S9 Internationalisation

Enhanced economic contribution to New Zealand through implementation of Massey University's internationalisation strategies.

The Investment Plan identifies the University as part of an international community as well as having national and regional responsibilities. The three major outcomes from the implementation of this strategy are defined as:

- being regarded internationally as one of the top 20 universities in the Asia-Pacific region and first in selected disciplines,
- attracting and retaining quality staff and high-achieving international students seeking world-class learning and research experiences, and
- growing and diversifying international markets particularly through relationships with governments, business and agencies and through building on a comprehensive experience in distance education delivery.

Key initiatives include further market diversification, increasing efforts to secure repeat cohorts of students from international origins, further developing the network of high-performing agents in overseas countries, increasing participation in staff and student exchanges and customisation of study-abroad relationships, furthering international teaching and research collaborations in strategic areas, increasing the proportion of postgraduate international student enrolments, further developing international research relationships and alumni networks, and delivering international distance degree and short-course programmes in target disciplines and countries.

Key performance indicators are around Asia-Pacific rankings, international enrolments, international student qualification completion rates, and the implementation of other key initiatives. Measurement of the 'enhanced economic contribution to New Zealand' through the implementation of the initiatives will be difficult.

The Portfolio acknowledges that the strategic priority 'initiatives' associated with international student recruitment and retention, student exchange and study abroad are well-established. In the view of the panel, these are, therefore, not initiatives. The Portfolio reports, however, that initiatives around collaborative teaching and research arrangements and international distance education are still at an early stage. The new administration wishes to get more clarity around the area of internationalisation which it acknowledges has a high level of complexity, and to aim for a targeted group of countries with which to build the strongest relationships.

It is clear that the University is determined to proceed with distance education offshore and has two improvement initiatives in this area. The first is to develop a framework for international delivery initiatives that outlines areas of greatest potential and includes the accreditation and delivery requirements of targeted countries (Improvement 31). The second is to develop mechanisms that will provide better information about the relevance and position of Massey's programmes in relation to other providers, and the needs of regional and international communities of interest (Improvement 32).

The University has a relatively long tradition of providing distance education to New Zealanders both nationally and internationally, although as reported earlier (section 2.2) the University community considers there is a need for increased investment in distance education, and in the e-learning necessary to support it, if the University is to maintain its position as a distance education provider. The panel remains to be convinced that the University's existing capability in distance education in New Zealand and to New Zealanders overseas necessarily positions the University to deliver academic programmes to international students offshore in cultural settings different from those in New Zealand.

Of more general importance to the panel were the mixed messages received from staff interviews about their understanding of internationalisation and the internationalisation of the curriculum. Internationalisation of the curriculum is among the priorities for the University administration, yet from interviews, it appears that staff understanding of this concept is limited to having international students on campus, the offering of papers offshore, international accreditation of academic programmes, and the employment of academic staff appointed from overseas.

Recommendation

R 16 The panel recommends that the University arrives at a clear understanding of internationalisation and internationalisation of the curriculum after discussion with the University community, and develops a conceptual framework for the implementation of internationalisation strategies.

The University is planning to become involved in offshore delivery of selected academic programmes, with the first qualification being the Bachelor in Food Technology being offered in Singapore. Programme delivery within a different cultural setting requires special support for those involved in it and this will place extra demands on the notion of equivalence. During on-site interviews with academic staff, it was suggested that the University worked hard to ensure equivalence of standards and learning outcomes among the three campuses, and that the University would have to be very careful to protect equivalence if offering academic programmes both in New Zealand and offshore.

The University recognises the lack of training of staff for offshore delivery in that it has an improvement initiative to develop support materials (including policy and procedures) for staff to develop and deliver offshore programmes in a manner that manages the risk and maximises the value to the University and its students (Improvement 30). The panel heard from staff that support materials were needed and that special training for staff to teach offshore was just beginning. It is the view of the panel that the University should have been more proactive in this area, given that it appears some offshore delivery of programmes is taking place already.

Affirmation

- A 9** The panel affirms the University's intention (Improvement 30) to develop support materials (including policy and procedures) for staff to develop and deliver offshore programmes in a manner that manages the risk and maximises the value to the University and its students, and urges the highest priority to the implementation of policy and procedures and to the training of academic staff.

After discussions with risk management personnel, the panel was not convinced that quality assurance around offshore delivery and the management of risk arising from offshore delivery have yet been properly addressed. In particular, it appears that the University has begun operations overseas without signing contracts. Policies, procedures and quality assurance around offshore delivery must be in place, and contracts signed before delivery offshore, and the quality assurance arrangements should include details of alternative delivery arrangements if there are impediments to maintaining the agreed arrangements.

Recommendation

- R 17** The panel recommends that the University ensures that signed contracts are in place prior to commencing delivery of offshore programmes and that each includes a definitive clause on teachout strategies.

The panel noted the initiative to undertake further international teaching and research collaborations in strategic areas. The panel was provided with a schedule of 218 'current offshore academic agreements' with 121 universities, polytechnics and research institutes as at the end of March 2008. An examination of the listing showed that not all agreements are current and that the list was not up-to-date. The University acknowledged these facts. The listing includes agreements that have expired and, in some cases, had been replaced by updated agreements, as well as rather general memoranda of understanding that have expired and been replaced by new agreements in more specific areas and activities. The listing does not indicate the extent to which these agreements are active or meaningful, and there was no evidence that the value to the University is being measured when agreements are reviewed or renewed.

The panel was told that international relationships are monitored with quarterly reports to the senior leadership. The University acknowledged that only a proportion of the listed agreements are valuable and active, and that the University's intention is to raise the level of engagement and to target 'first tier' universities and institutions, particularly for research partnerships, in ways that help leverage research funding for parties to each agreement. The University is also considering bringing cohorts of students from other countries through staircasing articulations, and through twinning programmes.

Acknowledgements

The panel thanks in particular Hon Steve Maharey (Vice-Chancellor), Professor Nigel Long (Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Research)), Shelley Paewai (Academic Policy Manager), and Malcolm Rees (Academic Quality Manager) for their support of the audit process and for the University's warm welcome to the audit panel. The panel thanks all those who contributed to the University's self-assessment process, the compilation of the self-assessment Portfolio and the organisation associated with the site visit. The panel is most grateful for the openness and frankness of those who gave of their time to appear before the panel.

Audit Panel

Chair of the Panel

Professor D Gareth Jones
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and International), University of Otago

New Zealand academic member of the Panel

Professor Hirini Matunga
Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori), Lincoln University

New Zealand non-academic member of the Panel

Dr Roberta Hill
Director, WEB Research, Wellington

Overseas members of the Panel

Dr Colleen Liston
Adjunct Professor, Curtin University of Technology, Western Australia

Professor V Lynn Meek
Director, L H Martin Institute of Higher Education, University of Melbourne

In attendance:

John M. Jennings
Director, New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit

Appendix 1

Massey University key improvements

Notes

- This listing of the University's key improvements as identified in the University's Portfolio associated with this academic audit is ordered according to the Unit's indicative framework for Cycle 4 audit. The section on 'Internationalisation' is extra to the Cycle 4 indicative framework to accommodate the University's strategic priorities.
- The numbering of the sections in this listing is the numbering of the sections of this report.
- The numbering of the improvements is in the order of improvements as summarised in the Portfolio, p.49-52.

1

General

▪ **Goals, objectives and plans**

University improvement 5

Underway

A revised Planning Framework with target key performance indicators is being progressively implemented in 2008.

2

Teaching and learning

▪ **Qualifications portfolio**

University improvement 17

Underway

Continue to pursue professional accreditation where available and where it will enhance the relevance and distinctiveness of the University's offerings.

University improvement 18

Planned

Investigate the need for additional requirements around the approval of new papers and programmes to ensure their alignment with the strategic goals set out in the Investment Plan (profile).

University improvement 19

Planned

Revisit the academic development plans for each campus (and extramural) to examine the mix of provision and the way in which it aligns to local requirements and the overall academic portfolio.

University improvement 20

Planned

Develop mechanisms that will provide better information about the relevance and position of Massey's programmes in relation to the other providers, and the needs of regional and international communities of interest. This might include the investigation of a benchmarking programme complemented by analysis of sector data at subject level.

▪ **Distance education and e-learning**

University improvement 16

Planned

Implemented agreed redevelopment goals for e-learning.

▪ **Student achievement**

University improvement 6 Underway
Review the definitions underpinning the generation of the University's retention, completion and progression reports and redevelop the reports so they can be used for accountability and improvement purposes.

▪ **Student evaluation of teaching and papers**

University improvement 7 Planned
Continue to participate in discussions regarding the Australian Council for Educational Research Australasian Survey of Student Engagement and explore continued use of the Survey at Massey University.

University improvement 8 Underway
Implement agreed revisions to the Graduate Destination Survey Questionnaire and Methodology in 2009 to include the Graduate Surveys of Research and Course Experience.

University improvement 9 Planned
Review, update, and implement the recommendations of the Teaching Evaluation Working Party [2005] to deliver a teaching evaluation system based upon effective practices.

3 Research environment

▪ **Research capability, performance and reputation**

University improvement 24 Underway
Develop a research management strategy that addresses:

- * *the ongoing implementation of the Research Information Management System as a central repository including responsibility for expanding the existing services to include reporting that will inform research improvement within the Colleges,*
- * *the co-ordination and communication of services for research support including the Community of Sciences Funding Opportunity Database,*
- * *effective training opportunities so that staff and managers can learn to use and report from the Research Information Management System,*
- * *any additional initiatives that will be required to support the College research improvement plans.*

University improvement 25 Planned
Investigate whether the Research Information Management System can be used in conjunction with information from Human Resources and the web Content Management System to develop and publish an on-line expertise database.

4 Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Pasifika

▪ **Kia Maia**

University improvement 14 Underway
Improvement initiatives as outlined within the Kia Maia strategy

- **Pasifika@Massey**

University improvement 15 Planned
Explore strategic collaboration internal and external to the University as a means to further develop and achieve the goals outlined in the Pasifika@Massey strategy.

5 Academic and support staff

- **Professional support and development**

University improvement 10 Underway
Review the purpose and function of the Centre for Academic Development and e-Learning to ensure that training and development initiatives are strongly aligned with the strategic priorities of the University and the needs of the Colleges.

University improvement 11 Planned
Ensure that opportunities for expanding research on effective teaching and learning are explored fully and within the context of external funds that may be available, internal research clusters within the Colleges, and the work of the Centre for Academic Development and e-Learning.

University improvement 13 Planned
Review the administration and methodology of the Staff Surveys to ensure alignment with international effective practices, and enhance the use of the survey outcomes at University and departmental levels.

7 Management and administrative support

- **Management and communication**

University improvement 1 Planned
Evaluate the existing methods of communication across the University and develop an action plan that will better enable staff to remain informed about initiatives and services that are most relevant to them.

University improvement 2 Underway
Continue to implement the Optimisation of Services Delivery Project as outlined on the University's intranet.

University improvement 3 Underway
Complete development of the Guidelines for the conduct of Council and Council subcommittees to enhance governance capability.

University improvement 4 Planned
Examination of the academic and managerial decision-making processes to ensure they facilitate the achievement of agreed University priorities and initiatives.

University improvement 12 Planned
Review progress on the leadership and management training package provided through the Human Resources Section and develop and implement an action plan to deliver the management training required by new academic and general managers.

- **Organisational capability and capacity**

University improvement 27 Underway
Finalise the Strategic Asset Management Plan and Information Services Strategic Plan and begin implementation of agreed priorities.

University improvement 28 Underway
Development and implementation of strategic capability plans supporting the University's human resource management.

University improvement 29 Underway
Implement agreed capital development plans for expansion of the library facilities at the Auckland and Wellington campuses.

8 External academic collaborations and partnerships

▪ Stakeholder engagement

University improvement 23 Underway
Continue to explore effective mechanisms for student engagement in all aspects of the University's operations and develop action plans for implementation of agreed improvements.

▪ Strategic collaboration

University improvement 21 Planned
Work with the New Zealand School of Music and Victoria University of Wellington to streamline existing arrangements for programme development and approval.

University improvement 22 Planned
Explore systems and processes to enhance research and knowledge transfer between the University and the Centres of Research Excellence.

▪ Commercialisation

University improvement 26 Underway
Develop a clear framework for commercialisation that outlines the responsibilities of the Enterprise Team and Massey Ventures, and includes an education programme for staff about commercial potential and the assistance available to identify and capitalise on commercial opportunities.

10 Internationalisation

▪ International strategies

University improvement 30 Underway
Develop support materials (including policy and procedures) for staff to develop and deliver offshore programmes in a manner that manages the risk and maximises the value to the University and its students.

University improvement 31 Planned
Develop a framework for international delivery initiatives that outlines areas of greatest potential and includes the accreditation and delivery requirements of targeted countries.

University improvement 32 Planned
Develop mechanisms that will provide better information about the relevance and position of Massey's programmes in relation to other providers, and the needs of regional and international communities of interest.

Appendix 2

Cycle 4 indicative framework

Update on the 'mid-term' report on Cycle 3 recommendations and university enhancement initiatives

Given the focus of Cycle 3 was teaching quality, programme delivery and the achievement of learning objectives, the university may wish to incorporate reports on recommendations and enhancement initiatives from Cycle 3 into relevant sections that follow.

	<i>Topics</i>	<i>Activities</i>
1	<i>General</i>	
2	<i>Teaching and learning</i>	2.1 The development, design, implementation and delivery of academic programmes and courses that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * develop intellectual independence, * are relevant to the needs of the disciplines, * are relevant to the needs of learners and other stakeholders. 2.2 The learning environment and learning support for students, including learning support for students from targeted groups. 2.3 Student achievement and success.
3	<i>Research environment</i>	3.1 Research students and research supervision. 3.2 Teaching and learning within a research environment. 3.3 The interdependence of research and teaching. 3.4 The role of critic and conscience of society.
4	<i>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</i>	4.1 The application of the principles ¹⁵ of Te Tiriti to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * access to learning, * curriculum.
5	<i>Academic and support staff</i>	5.1 The determination of an appropriate academic staff profile across the institution. 5.2 Recruitment, appointment and induction strategies. 5.3 The implementation and monitoring of workload models. 5.4 Professional support, development and appraisal of academic staff.
6	<i>Institutional quality assurance</i>	6.1 The internal planning-implementation-reporting-evaluation-enhancement cycle as applied to academic processes, academic programmes and courses.

¹⁵ A discussion of the implications for universities arising from the principles of Te Tiriti is found in John M Jennings (compiler), *New Zealand universities and Te Tiriti o Waitangi*, Wellington, New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit, 2004, 'AAU Series on Quality' no.4.
 Available at http://www.nzuaau.ac.nz/nzuaau_site/publications/asq/Te%20Tiriti%20o%20Waitangi.pdf

	<i>Topics</i>	<i>Activities</i>
7	<i>Management and administrative support</i>	7.1 The development of a management and administrative infrastructure that provides effective support to research-informed teaching and learning. 7.2 The determination of an appropriate management and administrative staff profile. 7.3 Professional support, development and appraisal of management and administrative staff.
8	<i>Community engagement</i>	8.1 The identification of stakeholders and communities of interest, the seeking of advice, and the application of information gained to curriculum and student learning.
9	<i>External academic collaborations and partnerships</i>	9.1 The development of external collaborative research and academic ventures and partnerships that impact on curriculum and student learning and achievement.

To each of these sections, the following questions are to be applied to each of the above topics.

Commitments

What are the goals and objectives and the expected outputs and outcomes in this area and how were they determined?

Strengths and progress

What are the key strengths in this area and what positive progress has been made in achieving the goals and objectives?

What are the output/outcome data and other evidence used to determine strengths and to judge progress, and how relevant and effective are they?

Challenges

What are the key challenges for the university in this area?

Monitoring

What key quality mechanisms and processes are used to monitor ongoing quality and to provide input into continuous improvement in this area, and how effective are they?

Enhancement

Arising from the self-assessment, what are the areas in which enhancement is needed?

What enhancement activities will be undertaken during the next planning period – say, three years – who will be responsible, and what are the expected outputs and outcomes of those enhancement activities?

How will the university monitor the effectiveness of changes arising from the enhancement activities?

Appendix 3

New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit

Terms of reference

The Unit's terms of reference are:

- to consider and review the universities' mechanisms for monitoring and enhancing the ongoing academic quality of academic programmes, their delivery and their learning outcomes, and the extent to which the universities are achieving their stated aims and objectives in these areas,
- to comment on the extent to which procedures in place in individual universities are applied effectively,
- to comment on the extent to which procedures in place in individual universities reflect good practice in maintaining quality,
- to identify and commend to universities national and international good practice in regard to academic quality assurance and quality enhancement,
- to assist the university sector to improve its educational quality,
- to advise the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee on quality assurance matters,
- to carry out such contract work as is compatible with its audit role.

The Unit acts as a fully independent body in the conduct of its audit activities.

Vision

- Quality New Zealand university education serving students' futures.

Mission

To contribute to quality New Zealand university education by:

- engaging as leader and advocate in the development of quality cultures,
- applying quality assurance and quality enhancement processes that enable improvement in student engagement, experience and learning outcomes.

Objective with respect to academic audits conducted during the period 2008-2012

- Timely completion of academic audits producing audit reports acknowledged as authoritative, fair and perceptive, and of assistance to universities.